

K
RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION;
OR A
VINDICATION OF DISSENTERS,
OF EVERY DENOMINATION:

WITH
A REVIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY, OCCASIONED
BY A LATE PASTORAL CHARGE OF THE
BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
HINTS FOR PASTORAL CHARGES.

BY
A Friend to Civil and Religious Liberty.

“TANTÆNE ANIMIS CÆLESTIBUS IRÆ.”—*Virg.*

“God forbid that the search after *Truth* should be discouraged
“for fear of its consequences! The consequences of Truth may
“be subversive of *Systems of Superstition*, but never can be in-
“jurious to the Rights, or well-founded Expectations, of the
“human Race.”—*Bishop of Landaff.*

London:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY THOMAS CLIO RICKMAN, UPPER
MARY-LE-BONE STREET;

AND TO BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

1799.



441
3 29
469

CONTENTS.

	Page
I NTRODUCTION,	
The Charge, — — —	1
Review of Wansey's Letter, — —	7
Remarks on Remarks, by a Country Curate, with an N. B. for his P. S. — —	20
Strictures on Strictures, or a Critic criticised, —	27
A word to the Authors of the Dissenters Done Over, and the Deplorable Malady of H. W. with a retort courteous, in doggrel rhyme, — —	40
A Rowland for an Oliver considered, — —	43
A Twig from a Broom for the Conventicle for the use of its Author, — — —	48
An Appeal to the People answered, — —	63
Rights of Discussion asserted, and Dissenters of every denomination vindicated, with free thoughts on Schism and Uniformity, — —	87
Hints for Pastoral Charges — —	104
Melioration of the Condition of the Inferior Clergy —	105
Tythes — — —	107
Discouragements to Matrimony — —	109
Duelling — — —	111
Irreverently trifling with the Name of the Lord —	117
Depravity of Modern Manners — —	123
Public Schools — — —	127

Universities

	Page.
Universities — — —	— 128
Inattentive Conduct in Places of Worship —	— 130
Primitive Christianity — —	— 132
Plea for the Poor — — —	— 133
A Warning Voice to the Rich —	— 141
Conclusion — — — —	— 148



INTRODUCTION.

“ Averse alike to flatter, or offend,

“ Not free from faults, nor yet too vain to mend.”

Pope.

AVERSE as I am to putting my foot even over the threshold of the Augean stable of *polemical controversy*, (being fully persuaded that Christianity is a system of practical benevolence, not a fire-brand of bigotted intolerance,) if RIGHTS of DISCUSSION *had not been called in question* by the Bishop of Salisbury in his late *Pastoral Charge*, and by Wansey's opponents in some pamphlets recently published, had I been in a room having two doors, if any *religious controversy* had entered in at one door I should certainly have walked out at the other. But however indifferent I may be as to doctrinal or ceremonial differences, knowing that shades of partial bigotry, when contrasted with the glorious light of rational intellect, will only place its deformity in a stronger point of view, I cannot suffer the war-whoop to be raised against so truly valuable a body of men as our fellow-subjects, the
dissenters

dissenters of every denomination ; nor spirits as bigotted as LAUD, as furious as SACHEVEREL, to cry, " Havoc, and let slip the dogs of war," without unfurling the banner of reason, and asserting the imprescriptible, unalienable, and universal RIGHTS of DISCUSSION in matters of conscience.

In reviewing the present controversy, I shall confine myself only to the matter in difference between the Bishop of Salisbury and the dissenters *, disclaiming all partial personality, all warmth and bitterness ; my opposition being to the errors of intolerance only, and not to the *persons* whose minds are unfortunately tainted with such a narrow spirit ; and so seriously have I the peace of the christian world, and the unlimited rights of discussion at heart, that had I the strength of a Sampson to pull down the temple of this modern Dagon, and to bring to the ground the strongly rooted pillars of prejudice and intolerance, I should think my fate glorious to be buried in the ruins.

I shall therefore be as brief in my remarks on the various publications which the Bishop's charge has

* The controversy about village preaching being foreign to the subject, I have not seen Mr. Clift's pamphlet, nor have I noticed Mr. Brian Monkhouse's letter, any further than the vindication of the dissenters rendered it necessary.

given rise to, as the nature of the arguments will admit; and hasten to observations of a general and interesting import, such as I hope and trust will be conducive to pierce the gloom of bigotry—allay the fires of intolerance—loosen the bands of despotism—and come home to every man's business, and every man's bosom.



RIGHTS

RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION.

CHAP. I.

THE CHARGE.

“ Instant I bade the Priests prepare

“ The RITUAL sacrifice, and solemn prayer.”

Prior.

THE points in controversy between the Bishop of Salisbury and Wansey are, the Bishop, in his late pastoral charge, sounded an alarm “ at the increased activity of Dissenters, of various denominations, and the great number of licensed Preachers registered in the course of the last year ; and urged the great expediency and necessity of exertions from the Parochial Clergy, to PREVENT THE DELUSIONS, to which the lower classes of people, especially in villages, are thereby exposed.”—*Wansey's Letter, fo. 2.*

A

Wansey

Wansey wishes, on the behalf of the Dissenters, to know, “ what is the proposed method
 “ of *lessening their numbers*, and *preventing* the
 “ lower classes of the people from following
 “ them; and is of opinion, that my Lord of
 “ Salisbury might have found more proper subjects for a Pastoral Charge than raising a discussion that has long been laid asleep, and
 “ turning his artillery against the Dissenters.”
 —*Wansey's Letter, fo. 2. and 3.*

With that opinion I perfectly coincide; and mean, before I lay down my pen, to furnish some hints for pastoral charges, which I trust will be allowed to be as well calculated to do good, as some late ones are for enlarging the borders of bigotry, and kindling a spirit of persecution.

That the public may judge how far Wansey's charges are well founded, I shall transcribe from the Salisbury and Winchester Journal of August 20, 1798, the printed account of the Bishop's charge, which H. Wansey has taken as the ground-work of his Letter:—

“ On Tuesday and Wednesday, the Right
 “ Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum held his
 “ third

“ third triennial visitation in the Cathedral.
 “ The charge was principally directed to the
 “ increased activity of DISSENTERS of VARIOUS
 “ DENOMINATIONS, and the *great number* of li-
 “ *censed Preachers* registered in the course of last
 “ year. The great expediency and necessity of
 “ exertions from the Parochial Clergy were
 “ urged, to *prevent the delusions* to which the
 “ lower classes of the people, especially in vil-
 “ lages, are thereby exposed; and the modes
 “ of instruction, best calculated for that end,
 “ were clearly described. The dangers of in-
 “ novation, and the false but prevalent philo-
 “ sophy of the times, were strongly urged,
 “ with their direful effects in a neighbouring
 “ country, in a plain but animated appeal to
 “ the hearts of the clergy and people, and to
 “ the conscious feelings peculiarly affecting the
 “ conduct of the former.”

That the account given of the charge in the
 Salisbury Journal is true, *so far as it goes*, I have
 no doubt whatever, as it stands to *this hour*
uncontradicted by any of the Bishop's very nu-
 merous and zealous clerical friends. But that
 the charge went further than it was thought ad-
 viseable to trust out of the *walls of the CATHE-*

DRALE, and that Wansey was fully justified in drawing the conclusion he has drawn from it, even in the *garbled state* in which it was presented to the public eye, I shall now prove from authorities, which, whether the Bishop of Salisbury will admit them or not, none of his advocates can object to, as they are literally transcribed from their own works.

To begin with the author of the *Appeal to the People*—an author whom Wansey's opponents have quoted and referred to with the greatest deference, and we shall find in the motto to his title-page, *on this occasion*, a very important fact circumstantially stated, which was but slightly mentioned in the printed account of the charge. “ The number of dissenting places of worship registered in the diocese of Salisbury, during eighteen years down to 1796 inclusive, did not, at an average, exceed annually *seven or eight*. But in the single year 1797, there have been opened and registered upwards of *forty*.”

In fo. 39. and 40. of the *Appeal* the author speaks out, and brings the charge home to his venerable diocesan. After having stated the increase

crease in number of *dissenting* places of worship, and of dissenting teachers, he adds, “ The fact
 “ indeed appears, to a common observer, incre-
 “ dible ; and had we not the highest authority
 “ for affirming it, we might perhaps reasonably
 “ suspect its truth. ‘ To our venerable and
 “ *learned diocesan* a very considerable share of
 “ praise and gratitude is undoubtedly due, by
 “ every true friend to his country ; *not only for*
 “ *the attention displayed, upon this occasion, to the*
 “ *welfare of the church* ; but for his earnest en-
 “ deavours, exerted to check the progress of
 “ their conversion, under a political view also.”

If any further testimony were necessary, in p. 44. of a pamphlet, that a country curate has called a Broom for the Conventicle, we find the following passage, the greater part of which is printed in capitals, to prevent it's being overlooked through haste or inadvertency.—“ Did
 “ not his Lordship say the same thing, but in
 “ far more elegant phrase ? ‘ With a faint
 “ hope expressed,’ says he, ‘ THAT NONE BUT
 “ RELIGIOUS AND THE PUREST MOTIVES INFLU-
 “ ENCED THE PERSONS CONCERNED, it was sig-
 “ nified, THAT IT BECAME THE CLERGY TO BE
 “ AS MUCH UPON THEIR GUARD AGAINST THE
 “ PROBABLE

“ PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES, AS AGAINST
 “ THE EXISTING EVIL.”

Having thus fully stated and established the points in difference, I shall conclude this chapter with observing, that whatever the Bishop of Salisbury's feelings may be on the subject of this controversy, the friends of truth and reason cannot but *rejoice* at its having been started,—for the more the deep-rooted tree of prejudice is agitated and shaken, the looser will it's hold be on society, and the sooner will it's bitter and hollow fruit fall to the ground;—he may have reason to exclaim, who shall deliver me from the rash zeal of misjudging friends! whilst the friends of civil and religious liberty, the advocates for the RIGHTS of DISCUSSION will do as was done in respect to the late Edmund Burke, on his publishing his Observations on the French Revolution; drink health to the Bishop of Salisbury, and thanks for the discussion that he hath provoked.

CHAP. II.

REVIEW OF WANSEY'S LETTER TO THE BISHOP
OF SALISBURY.

“ Discourfing of *matters dubious*, and many *controvertible truths*, we cannot, without *arrogancy*, intreat a *credulity*, or implore any further affent than the *probability of our reasons*.”

Brown's Vulgar Errors.

IN confidering Wanfey's Letter to the Bifhop, having no particular party or narrow dogmas to defend, whilft I give him all the credit he deferves, for taking up the caufe of his diffenting brethren, and fpeaking out like a man, without refpect of perfons, he muft not be offended, if I point out wherein, in my opinion, he has defervedly incurred fome of the many cenfures which his opponents have brought againft him.

To begin with the title-page: I wifh Wanfey had chofen fome motto more fuitable to the ferious and important objects before him. I difapprove of throwing general cenfures on any religious

religious persuasion whatever ; and can by no means admit the wit of Hudibras as conclusive evidence against so respectable a body of men as the clergy of the national establishment.

The introductory paragraph to his Letter is not only respectful and proper, but perfectly consistent with his whole Letter. I defy his numerous opponents to point out, the rough simile of the great dog not excepted, a single passage in his whole Letter that derogates from “ the deference due to the Bishop’s exalted station, the amiableness of his private life, and the deserved eminence of his literary character.”

The observation, fo. 3. of the Strictures, by a Critic, “ that this epistle contains, either directly or indirectly, one continued censure or reproach on his Lordship’s *general* conduct,” is inaccurate. If the word *public* had been used by this weigher of words, instead of the epithet *general*, it would have superseded the necessity of this flimsy remark, and have justified Wansley’s consistency, who, with every deference for the amiableness of the Bishop’s private life, has a right to arraign his *public* conduct.

It

It is not the loud clamour of illiberal partizans that can vindicate the Bishop from the serious charges brought against him, by Wansey's Letter: he must not only disown such parts of the charge, so publicly ascribed to him, as accuse the dissenters with *deluding* their hearers; but must also disclaim the narrow sentiments imputed to him by the author of the Appeal to the People.

If the author of that appeal wishes, like another Sacheverell, by calling an impeachment on his head, to become the idol of high-church bigotry, he will miss his aim.

The *doctrines* deserve to be impeached; but after the SIEGE OF HASTINGS, which lasted almost as many years as the siege of Troy, who could now venture on a parliamentary impeachment, unless he were qualified

“ To sit, like Patience, on a monument,
“ Smiling at Grief.”

Nothing can put the foreness of Wansey's opponents in a stronger light than their being so bitter on the following passage:—

B

“ To

“ To use a rough simile, if sheep are feeding
 “ quietly in separate pastures, and a great dog
 “ barks at them, they will all fix their eyes on
 “ him, and herd together the closer.”

Can any man, with either candour or justice, charge Wansey, on the authority of this paragraph, with calling the Bishop of Salisbury a great dog?---If Wansey were upon his trial for a charge of such scurrility, before an impartial jury, would this passage be admitted even to be read in evidence against him; much less to condemn him? Would not an able and impartial judge, in summing up on such an occasion, observe that the evidence was irrelevant, if it meant to apply the allusion to any *person* whatever? that the simile was true in nature, and strongly illustrative of the doctrine laid down in the context, *viz.* “ The impolicy of meddling
 “ with dissenters at all, as persecution would
 “ only tend to unite them more closely, as sheep,
 “ at the barking of a great dog, would herd the
 “ closer together?” and would not any, but a packed jury, be unanimous in their verdict of acquittal?

But even admitting, without intending to apply any curish or canine qualities to the Bishop,
 (for

(for had Wansey been capable of such conduct to a character, whom he himself states to be amiable in private life, and venerable for learning, I would have been the last to have defended him,) that Wansey had compared a Christian pastor to a great sheep-dog, (for to a sheep-dog only this rough simile alludes,) I know not where he could have found a happier comparison. Under the Jewish law such an allusion would have been improper, as dog was a term of reproach; and those valuable and faithful animals, very fortunately for their carcases, were classed amongst the unclean beasts: but, under the Christian Dispensation, when Christ compares his true followers to sheep, and himself to the *door*, by which his sheep enter, need any humble minister be offended at being compared to a dog, who by his faithful barking drives off the wolf on the one hand, and drives the sheep to this blessed door on the other? Surely no pastor, under that good shepherd, who compared himself to an *inanimate* door, need be hurt at being compared to a living dog, which we are told by Solomon is better than a dead lion.

I have been the more full in my observations on this passage, because almost all the personal

scurrilities that have been pointed against Wansey, have been founded on the misunderstanding, or wilful misapplication, of this rough, but just and striking simile.

I wish I could as easily vindicate him from the charge of illiberality, when he speaks of the clergy of the established church. I do not believe that since the first ages of christianity, any church ever boasted more purity, liberality, and learning, than the church of England: and if there *must* be an established church, the history of our country proves, that the church of England hath been more tolerant than the dissenters were in their day of power. All that we have to regret for the church is, its being burthened with articles, an Athanasian creed, and a form of cursing, to which all the people are *required to say* AMEN! and so fearful of innovation, that it dares not touch, even with the tenderest hand, the allowed imperfections of its Book of Common Prayer.—Christ planted his universal and true catholic church without any civil establishment, and Providence sets up and humbles states! but who made church and state? to quote Wansey's favourite poet,

“ God made the country, but man made the town.”

Cowper.

The

The clergy of the church of England have most of them had the advantages of a liberal education. I trust there are but very few amongst them who do not deserve to be classed with scholars, and ranked with gentlemen; and I think, the modest diffidence of their own abilities, which leads them to bring forward those valuable materials, with which the works of the luminaries of the church of England so richly abound, rather than any crude compositions of their own, not only unobjectionable, but highly praise-worthy.

As I cannot agree with Wansey on these points, I should forfeit all claim to impartiality, were I not to censure his narrow observations on the dress and manners of the clergy.

To those who do not object to field-sports, on the ground of *cruelty* to birds or animals, I know no reason why a young clergyman, who must necessarily have much leisure on his hands, should not take out a license to shoot, or enjoy the sports of the field. Where could his mind be more free to study, and more elevated to the true sublime, than in the solitude of fields, beneath the glorious canopy of Heaven?

I am

I am inclined to think, that if our spiritual teachers, of every denomination, looked more to Nature's God through Nature's works, that their discourses and habits of thinking would be more sublime and liberal than those, which we too often hear from pulpits, where superstition opens the door, and bigotry shuts them in.

Whilst I am speaking thus of pulpits, I would by no means be understood to confine myself to the pulpits of the established clergy. Bigotry and intolerance, I am sorry to be under the necessity of stating, flame in the cool synods of presbytery, fulminate from the tubs of methodism, and murmur in the solemn groans of a quakers meeting. For myself, I believe, true Christianity, like true patriotism, too liberal and benevolent to be confined within the narrow pale of SECT or PARTY ; and should not hesitate for one moment to communicate with the church of England in a morning, and with a dissenting or methodistical congregation in the evening, provided they were agreed in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, however widely they might differ in their construction of particular terms or tenets, or matters of church government.

Before

Before Wansey made observations on the dress and manners of the clergy, he should have remembered, that many of our clergy are the younger branches of families of the first respectability, who have been sent into the church, not by their own choice, but by the act of their parents, as a temporal provision. Previous to their being ordained, they followed hunting and shooting, as their morning amusements, in common with other gentlemen : and is Wansey become so strong an episcopalian as to believe, that the mere imposition of a bishop's hands in ordination can instantaneously change their habits of life and modes of thinking ?

The remarks on the dress of the clergy are not only illiberal, but some of them do not appear to me to be founded in fact.—Whether young clergymen, who belong to a hunt, may perchance have worn a scarlet spencer, as the uniform of the hunt, I know not : I can only say, I have travelled far and wide, and never yet saw a clergyman in a scarlet coat. But, supposing them to dress in scarlet, does not Wansey know, that scarlet is mourning in some countries, as purple is royal mourning in this ?—has he forgotten the charge against the Pharisees of old, of making
clean

clean the *outside* of the cup? If external dress were an essential qualification for a minister in any church, instead of bishops and presbyters, we must send our young students to semstresses and taylors to trick them out, and shape them for their spiritual functions.

Being at a loss to account for this charge on any *serious* ground, shall we venture to conjecture, that the *Wiltshire clothier* may *himself* be a *manufacturer* of SCARLET CLOTH; and this *just and necessary war* not having occasioned a sufficient demand for scarlet on the one hand, and the *censure* of the *Dissenter done over* being sufficient to make it the “kick of the fashion” amongst the clergy on the other, he has condemned the young clergy for wearing SCARLET to increase the demand, and enhance the price of the commodity.

There is another passage in Wansey's letter wherein he insinuates, that, “If we could give
 “the greatest champions of the church a thousand
 “a year more than they at present have,
 “it might turn their artillery against those very
 “doctrines which, in the present state of things,
 “they are so earnest to maintain.” This remark

mark is improper and uncharitable: improper, because it belongeth only to the first of beings to read the secret thoughts, and search the hidden purposes of the human heart; and uncharitable, because Charity not only thinketh no evil, but, in the true spirit of candour, hopeth all things for the best, and in doubtful cases always inclines to the favourable side.

With these few exceptions, I agree with Wansey, in thinking that the Bishop, instead of being alarmed, ought rather to rejoice at the increase of dissenters of every persuasion; and that, whilst infidelity and vice are stalking abroad without controul, it was his duty to have been liberal towards his fellow labourers in the vineyard, and to have hailed them with, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

As to the stories that Wansey has told, that of the Bishop of Beauvais is very applicable to the clerico-military spirit of these times; and he was certainly at liberty, if he so pleased, to enliven the dulness of polemical controversy, without any licence from Mr. Critic or any other person first had or obtained.

A great outcry, in which, as usual in such cases, there is more cry than wool, has been raised against Wansey, for his remarks on the Vicar of Scarborough's consecration prayer. Why the soldiers should not be capable of joining in prayer on such occasion, I cannot even conjecture; and am willing to give the Vicar of Scarborough credit for having meant well: but, if the name of the Prince of Peace must be taken in vain, on such improper subjects, the ceremony of consecration should be performed by the captain, (for I trust we have captains who can pray as well as swear,) and not by the chaplain, it being incompatible with the character of the followers of that Jesus, who came to preach not war and blood, but peace on earth, and good will to the inhabitants thereof. I would recommend to these *holiday consecrators*, before they venture to offer up prayers, more suited to the temple of Bellona than the spirit of Christ, to consider what David said to Solomon,—Chron. I. chap. xxii. v. 7. and 8. “ And David said to Solomon, My
 “ son, as for me it was in my mind to build an
 “ house unto the name of the Lord my God:
 “ but the word of the Lord came to me, say-
 “ ing, thou HAST SHED BLOOD ABUNDANTLY,
 “ and hast made great wars, thou *shalt not build*
 “ An

“ *an house unto my name*, BECAUSE *thou* HAST
 “ SHED MUCH BLOOD upon the earth in my
 “ fight.”—What, would not the MOST HIGH
 suffer David, even under the *Jewish Dispensation*,
 to build the walls of his temple, because his
 hands were stained with blood? and shall
 Christian ministers presume to bring their con-
 secrations, breathing blood, into the temple of
 the mild and benevolent Author of the Christian
 System?

But, though Wansey hath been incorrect in some
 respects, he deserves the thanks of society for
 the rectitude of his intentions. I have been told
 that such is the wrathful spirit which disgraces
 some little minds, that, when Wansey appears in
 public, they shun him, and even with-hold
 from him their salutations in the market-place.

To be shunned by such men is a source of
 self-congratulation; and whilst bigotry shrinks
 from him on the one side, and intolerance pres-
 ses on him on the other, the friends to Rights
 of Discussion will give him the right hand of
 fellowship.

CHAP. III.

REMARKS ON THE REMARKS BY A COUNTRY
CURATE, WITH AN N. B. to HIS P. S.

“ How I have sped amongst the Clergymen,
“ The sums I have collected shall express.”

Shakespeare.

WITH that impartiality, which I profess to be my guide, I give the author of these Remarks credit for their general candour and good sense; and am only astonished, that the author of so gentlemanly a letter could produce a P. S. so unworthy of himself,

I admit, that the members of any established or dissenting church, when they have voluntarily become members of a religious society, must be subject to it's regulations, as those of other societies are; but I deny any right of coercion in any established or dissenting church, or in any power on earth to compel me to become a member of any religious society, or to make rules to
restrain

restrain or prohibit my right of discussion, and judging for myself in all matters of conscience.

“ It certainly is not necessary that every
 “ thing of a public nature should be printed,
 “ that no wrong interpretation may be made of
 “ it ;” but the Bishop of Salisbury’s late
 charge, being an attack on numerous and respectable classes of our fellow subjects, who, from conscientious motives, could not be expected to be hearers of pastoral charges in established churches or cathedrals, candour and justice demanded that such a charge should be published, to give the accused parties a fair opportunity of answering for, and clearing themselves from the odium of deluding the lower classes of village hearers, and from the *improper political views*, so boldly imputed to them.

The account of the charge, published in the Salisbury paper, standing uncontradicted, by authority, and having been confirmed in the fullest manner, by the Appeal to the People, it would certainly have been a work of supererogation in Wansey, to have called on the Country Curate for information, that was publicly known wherever the Salisbury paper had been circulated, or the Appeal to the People read.

Whether

Whether “ Priestcraft or persecution, as applied to the English constitution, are as foreign “ from facts as light from darkness,” let those decide, who remember, that a Bill for Relief of Quakers, suffering under persecution in common goals, for *matters of conscience only*, though its principle was acknowledged to be just, and though it was supported by the law-learned eloquence of the late Serjeant Adair, was recently thrown out of the House of Commons;—let those decide, who know, that, in the luminous æra of George the Third, the methodists have been frequently harrassed and persecuted on, that disgrace to our statute-books, the Conventicle Act, made in the infamous reign of the no less infamous Charles the Second.

Does not this author know, notwithstanding much has been done by the Toleration Act, and more by the liberality of the present day, to soften our penal laws, that much remains behind?—Does he not know that our statute-books are yet disgraced with penal and disabling laws against dissenters of every denomination, with acts that outrage Rights of Discussion, and are incompatible with the peace and best interests of society? I trust the day is at hand, when priestcraft

craft and persecution will flee away, as shadows of a dark and comfortless night; and such discussion as the present cannot but accelerate it's approach.

With most of the cursory hints in defence of the inferior clergy I cordially agree. The remark, that many of them never enjoy the income which the *charges of their education* would have purchased is incontestibly true, to the disgrace and reproach of an establishment, which, whilst it provides princely incomes for dignitaries, pluralists, and the higher order of it's beneficed clergy, does not allow those, who bear the heat and burthen of the day, a sufficient competence to furnish them with even the necessaries of life. How is a curate, who has a wife and family, to maintain them in a manner to gain respect in the eyes of his parishioners, upon the starving pittance of £40. or £50. a year, an allowance inferior to the appointments and perquisites of many classes of menial servants. It is written "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn;" and those who minister to the altar should at least be enabled to live by it, if they must not aspire to lawn sleeves, or expect to fare sumptuously every day. The inferior

rior clergy could once boast of a Landaff for their champion; and I am inclined to think, that his excellent talents would be more usefully employed in promoting some melioration in the condition of the inferior clergy, than in interfering with national politics.

But, whilst I give the clergy all the credit they deserve for adhering to a church, which has used them so hardly, I do not give them equal credit for suffering with so much tameness. Patience carried to an extreme is weakness. Reason and justice are with them; they have only to act in concert with each other, and their wrongs would be redressed; and it is their duty to speak out on this subject, as owing to difficulties in which poverty involves them. True Religion is too often wounded in the house of her friends. An N. B. to the P. S.

“ In this reply to the dissenter’s letter I have studiously avoided every expression of harshness !” Is it possible that the writer of this passage could, on occasion of the rough simile used by Wansey, which I have defended in the preceding chapter, and which the country curate was in full possession,

feſſion of, when he wrote the ſentence I have juſt quoted, ſo far forget himſelf as to write in his P. S. “ That the concluſion has been, that
 “ Wanſey ought to be treated as a puppy
 “ dog!!! by every man, pretending to good
 “ manners, or even common decency, and expelled the ſociety of all communities, who
 “ have the leaſt title to credit or reſpect ?”

Had Wanſey even merited the cenſure imputed to him, the Country Curate ought to have remembered, and imitated his example, who,
 “ when he was reviled, reviled not again.” The criticiſm on Wanſey’s motto had better have been omitted, unleſs the remarkers had been leſs faulty; the whole of his motto being more applicable to a church, that ſwallows oaths and teſts, than to churches which reject them.

“ But ſaints, whom vows and oaths oblige,
 “ Know little of their privilege.”

The reaſon of the Country Curate’s changing his tone to Wanſey is too curious to be omitted.
 “ As the letter is announced to be written by
 “ the author of a tour to the United States of
 “ America, I feel myſelf under a neceſſity of
 “ dropping my pen, and of acknowledging my-
 D “ ſelf

“ self incapable to write a word more.” Wansey may exclaim with Romeo, “ Oh ! tell me, friar ; tell me in what vile part of this anatomy doth my name lodge ! tell me, that I may sack the hateful mansion.” The fine irony of the concluding paragraph of the P. S. however pleasing to its author, I am at loss to discover ; and have only to regret, that he should unfortunately so far have recovered the shock he received at the first mention of *Wansey's name*, as to have been capable of *resuming* his pen : that he has not yet recovered that spirit of candour and good sense which pervade his letter, must be evident to those who peruse his P. S. or his late palsied effort, which he is pleased to call a Broom for the Conventicle.

CHAP. IV.

STRICTURES UPON STRICTURES ; OR A CRITIC CRITICISED.

“ Who can think himself so considerable as not to dread
“ this mighty man of demonstration, this prince of contro-
“ vertists ?”

“ Critics I saw, that others names deface,
“ And fix their own with labour in their place.”

WHEN I consider how presumptuously the author of these Strictures upon Wansley's Letter has volunteered, in taking on himself the office of corrector to any literary or grammatical inaccuracies, which may have escaped the notice of Wansley, and the self-complacency and dogmatical authority with which this prince of pedants, this Dionysius, the last and least, has ushered his Strictures to the world ; though I am sensible of the impertinence of verbal criticisms in great and important questions, I trust I shall stand excused, if I detain the attention of my readers from more weighty matter, whilst I hold up

this doughty writer *in terrorem*, with a view to deter any future critic from such a waste of words and time.

To those critics whose aim is instruction, and who are more happy in pointing out beauties than faults, the literary world is fully sensible of it's obligations; but we must not confound the screams of the solemn bird of night with the plaintive warblings of the nightingale, nor the sublime of a Longinus with the low nibbling of a Zoilus.

The late venerable Bishop of London, and the authors of *Hermes*, and of the learned *Diversions of Purley*, are justly entitled to our warmest praise, for their laborious efforts in the cause of grammar; but, on momentous questions would they have rejected important advice on account of grammatical inaccuracies? certainly not: and many a discovery in arts and sciences, many an improvement in manufactures, agriculture, and commerce, would have been lost to the world, if none but first-rate scholars had been permitted to put in their claim to public attention. If, when his Majesty, on his late journey to Weymouth, honoured the Wiltshire Volunteer Cavalry,

valry with those particular attentions, with which they were so highly flattered, an accident had happened in their evolutions to some of the troop, and an outcry had been raised that three men *was* thrown by *his* horses; what reception would that cold-blooded critic have deserved from the surrounding multitude, who, instead of quickening his pace, at the call of humanity, to fetch a surgeon, or render any assistance within his power, would have contented himself with shrugging up his shoulders and observing, that, *men* being the *plural*, the *verb* should have been the *plural also*; and that *his* should have been *their*, as applied to the horses?

Again, if at the festive assembly which was held in the Council-house in Salisbury, in honor of our naval victories, an alarm of fire had been given, would not that trifling wretch, who, on the outcry of fire! fire! the *rooms is* on fire! the *rooms is* on fire! instead of hastening to call an engine, or putting his hand to the nearest bucket, had amused himself with animadverting on the grammar, and pointing out that the *nominative plural* in each sentence required *are*, instead of *is*, have been well entitled to have a bucket soufed over him, or the first engine played

ed

ed upon him? Yet such is the conduct of the author of the *Strictures on Wansey's Letter*. Wansey addresses himself to the Bishop, on a subject that involves all that is dear to us, as beings capable of thought here, and fitted for immortality hereafter; and when, upon such a subject, a critic contents himself with weighing words, instead of attending to their weightier meanings, he reminds me of Hotspur's celebrated description of a prig of a courtier's address to him, whilst he was smarting from honourable wounds received in his country's cause:—

“ I then, all smarting with my wounds, being
 “ cold,
 “ To be so pester'd with a popinjay,
 “ Out of my grief and my impatience
 “ Answer'd neglectingly, I know not what,
 “ He should or should not—for he made me mad
 “ To see him shine so brisk, and smell so sweet,
 “ And talk so like a waiting gentlewoman.”

Shak. first part Hen. IV.

That I may not be charged with misrepresentation, I shall lay a few specimens of these very important and candid criticisms before the reader.

“ *Have*

“ *Have published,*’ should have been written,
 “ simply, *publish*. And again, before we arrive
 “ at the period, ‘ *have been made,*’ should have
 “ been expressed, *be made*. But ‘ *interpretation*
 “ *made,*’ surely, is not distinguishable for ele-
 “ gance.”—*Strictures*, fo. 4.

“ Does he understand the meaning of *tense* ;
 “ or the essential difference between the *present*
 “ and the *past perfect*? This Letter is dated
 “ September the eleventh, and the supposed
 “ Charge appeared in the Salisbury Journal,
 “ on the twentieth of the preceding month ;
 “ and yet the grammarian says, *is published*.
 —*Strictures*, fo. 4.”

With deference to Mr. Critic, does he mean to deny the fact, and to say that the charge is not published? *Are* not his elegant criticisms published on this day, to all intents and purposes, as fully as on the day when they first made their appearance in the diocese of Sarum?

“ In the sentence immediately following,
 “ he says, ‘ *he;*’ and then comes, ‘ *enemies.*’
 —*Fo.* 6.

“ *Rather,*

“ *Rather*, at the beginning of this paragraph,
“ in a superfluous word.—*Fo.* 7.

“ In the note to this paragraph ‘are’ for
“ clergymen, is another instance of false gram-
“ mar.”—*Fo.* 9.

“ The nominative case, ‘*Men*,’ has no cor-
“ respondent verb, either expressed, or impli-
“ ed!”—*Fo.* 13. An observation most wor-
thy of a note of admiration.—*Risum teneatis*
amici.

“ By misplacing the word, ‘*only*,’ he has
“ completely subverted his intended sense.”—
Fo. 14.

“ With respect to, ‘*The* state,’ found in the
“ next sentence, my duty is, *from the unpleasant*
“ *office, I have undertaken*, to inform Mr. W.
“ that there exists a clear distinction between
“ the import of the article, *A*, and the article,
“ *The*. The one is a definite; the other, an
“ indefinite article.”—*Fo.* 17.

“ In the third line, ‘*the* religion,’ is liable
“ to exception. It was intended, I presume,
“ to

“ to signify *our* religion, or the *Christian* religion.”—*Fo.* 20.

Ex pede Herculem,—And I trust these little scraps and parings *present* a sufficient specimen of the spirit of *candour* that pervades the elaborate and hypercritical strictures, now under our consideration.

In *fo.* 10. and 20. to contrast no doubt his own book-learning the more strikingly with Wansley's inaccuracies, terms of rhetoric that may be picked up in any school-room by any puerile declaimer, such as *Aposiopesis*; the *Erotesis*, and the *Ecphonesis*, are brought forward with uncommon splendour.

I once knew a truly worthy clergyman, who having been nominated to a country cure, instead of parading high-sounding terms, with Mr. Critic, employed himself in selecting, amongst synonymous words, those which would convey his meaning to his rustic audience with the greatest simplicity.

“ They leave your church in the peaceable possession of all *their* emoluments.’ The poor
E “ man

“ man, in his zeal, again forgot the rules of
 “ grammar. *Her* emoluments should be the
 “ words.”—*Fo.* 21.

Perhaps not, Mr. Critic ; for if you call to mind that, since the expulsion of the non-conformists, the established clergy, though only a part of the ministry of the country have enjoyed the *whole of the emoluments* set apart, by authority, for those who labour in the heavenly vineyard ; you must admit, that Wansey stated the fact with great accuracy, when he said, “ They leave
 “ *your* church in the peaceable possession of all
 “ *their emoluments*”

If Wansey had been a pupil, under the tuition of the Critic, he might have been offended with him at his quitting school without leave ; but, as he was not, surely he was at liberty to make his tour to the United States, without the licence of this gentleman ; nor would Wansey have deserved the character of wisdom, whatever Mr. Critic may think of it, “ if his private motives
 “ had not been better known to himself than
 “ to the world.”

The author of the *Strictures* seems much hurt, that Wansey should aspire to be a literary character :

character;—can the Critic give us a reason why? Is he the door-keeper to the Temple of Literature? if he be, he apes the manner of porters in some great houses, whose office seems, if we may judge from their furliness, to be banging the door to shut out guests, instead of opening it, to admit them.

But the real grievance, with respect to Wansey's Tour, was his venturing to *publish* an account of this excursion to the United States of America. I have not seen the Work; but, from the report given of it by several of the Reviewers, I have reason to form a favourable opinion of that production, notwithstanding the observations that have been made by Mr. Critic, and Wansey's opponents, to the contrary.*

We certainly have a right to expect, that any one, who plumes himself on being so critical, should at least have been correct; yet we find, in fo. 3. the epithet *general*, inaccurately used, instead of *public*. Fo. 18. he says, " But here
 " comes another story, let us make room for it,

E 2

and

* See British Critic, February, 1797—Monthly Review, April 1797—and the Critical Review, July, 1797.

and *transcribe it literally* ;” and yet, to the disappointment of his readers, this high priest of accuracy does *not transcribe it at all* !

With respect to his observation, fo. 29. that the following sentence violates the rules of grammar, *viz.* “ That the strength and duration of the Roman empire *was* greatly owing,” if he will turn to Lowth’s Grammar, p. 108. he will find Wansey’s justification, in the following words : “ But sometimes, after an *enumeration* “ of *particulars*, thus connected, the verb follows in the *singular number*, and is understood “ as applied to *each* of the preceding terms.”

“ Let me also instruct *my pupil* in this philosophical truth ; that the two words, *observations* and *remarks*, have each a distinct “ meaning.”—Page 30.

If the critic had given himself the trouble of looking into Johnson’s Dictionary, he would have found remark and observation used *indifferently*, as *synonymous* terms ; and authorities quoted from Locke, Pope, and others, that justify Wansey as fully, as they condemn the above frivolous criticism !

In

In fo. 3. alluding to the rough simile, he observes, “ The bare mention of this circumstance would prove sufficient to raise the indignation of the *most supine*, could any thing, which proceeded from *the pen of H. W.* deserve such *serious* notice ;” and yet we find Wansey’s Letter honoured, not only with the luminous strictures of his self-appointed preceptor, but with the serious notice of the Rowland for an Oliver, and the remarks of the Country Curate, both in his first letter, and in his recent publication.

In fo. 19. he blames Wansey for selling his Letter at one shilling, though he very modestly rates these weighty Strictures at the same price.

I cannot put such invaluable Strictures in a more striking point of view, than by presenting my readers with a specimen of *such criticisms*, with the text on one side, and the important strictures on the other :—

TEXT.

STRICTURES.

The Dissenters are just- ly alarmed at the Bishop’s Charge.	}	Wants a tittle top to the <i>i</i> in Bishop. <i>Bow! wow!</i>
--	---	---

TEXT.

TEXT.

STRICTURES.

The overgrown in-
comes of the superior
clergy form but too stri-
king a contrast with the
scanty pittance of the
inferior, but equally va-
luable labourers in the
Lord's vineyard.

} A break (—) wanting.

How alarming it is,
that many new places of
worship have been open-
ed, by Dissenters, even
since the delivery of the
late Pastoral Charge

} Wants a note of ad-
miration (!)

The observations I
shall make in my com-
ments.

} Dele *observations* and
insert *remarks*.

Bow! wow!

The indifference of
all orders of men to mat-
ters that concern their
immortal souls

} Wants a *full stop*.

Bow! wow! wow! Bow! wow! wow!
My heels are alarmed—my ears are stunned—
but

but my head is neither enlightened, nor my heart warmed, with such profound and candid criticisms !

I doubt not, but that, in the course of this pamphlet, I shall leave some inaccuracies in grammar or punctuation, for such strainers at gnats, and swallowers of camels, to dissect and bolt ; and, wishing them a keen appetite, I shall conclude this chapter with retorting Mr. Critic's concluding question :—

“ Is this critic, therefore, entitled to that
“ portion of literary merit which he arrogates—
“ or—*not* ? ”

“ And now, *my friend*, I have done.”

CHAP. V.

A WORD TO THE AUTHORS OF THE TRUE ACCOUNT OF THE DEPLORABLE MALADY OF H.W. AND OF THE DISSENTER DONE OVER, WITH A SPECIMEN OF DOGGREL RHYME.

“ Thus well-bred spaniels civilly delight,
 “ In mumbling of the game they dare not bite.”

“ ————— Nec lex æquior ulla est
 “ Quam necis artifices arte perire suâ.”

THE title of the *Dissenter done over* speaks so fully for the *liberality* of it's author, that it needs no other comment. I lament, that the author of the Deplorable Malady of H. W. after declaring, “ that no one can reprobate *personal satire* “ more *than himself*, should use so unwarrantable an expression, as “ a farrago of *lies* ;” a term never used amongst gentlemen, and very unbecoming the character of a Clergyman : nor have his doggrel rhymes the least pretence to novelty to atone for their illiberality. The
 farce

farce of ludicrously charging an author, whom he could not seriously answer, with insanity, was introduced by Pope, in his miscellanies.

We trust that the P. P. of Sarum does not claim any alliance with the celebrated Peter Pindar, nor with the truly humourous author of Memoirs, by P. P. the Parish-clerk, in Pope's Miscellanies. As the P. P. of Sarum hath been pleased to set up a laugh on one side, I shall stand excused for *retorting* it; protesting, at the same time, against Ridicule's being admitted as a test of truth; and thinking it highly improper, that a letter, on a most important subject, should receive ludicrous answers in doggrel rhyme.

THE RETORT COURTEOUS.

Attend, neighbours all, to a tale that is new;
Of what happen'd in Sarum to H. W.
A stone from the spire fell plump on his head,
And stunn'd him so much he scarce knew what he
said.

Two comical jockies were passing along,
One a dealer in strictures, the other in song,
With the eye of a duck, and the brain of a goose,
On the Clothier of Wilts each his fury let loose;

F

And

And, weakly combining to seize what he had,
 Without hesitation, gave out he was mad;
 And they, a *lunatick committee*, forsooth,
 Which assertion, mayhap, is not far from the truth,
 So pell mell they fell to't, like Arab or Turk,—
 With his *writings* and *notes* made most terrible work;
 And, swearing they'd leave the *non con* in the lurch,
 Cast *bells* from his *metal* to call folks to *church*.
 But what at the Critic made people to laugh,
 Was his trampling on *wheat*, and his champing the
chaff:

And who at his budget could choose but to grin?
 For he threw out the *kernels* and put the *shells* in.
 Whilst t'other to Scarborough whipp'd in a trice,
 To bring the *church militant* in for a slice;
 And so much was he pleased with the mischief
 before ye,

It will do, he exclaimed, for a *sonnet* or story!
 A sonnet or story I rarely will dish up,
 Who knows, it may gain me a bow from the Bishop?
 So a story he made, and 'tis sold for four-pence,
 Which is *more* than 'tis worth, for it's candour or
 fence.

CHAP. VI.

THE ROWLAND FOR AN OLIVER.

“ Let not my weak unknowing hand,
 “ Presume thy bolts to throw ;
 “ Or deal damnation round the land,
 “ On each *I judge* thy foe.”

Pope's Univ. Prayer.

THE author of the Rowland for an Oliver, must excuse me from following him into France, or entering into any defence of Mr. Godwin, or the Corresponding Society. No man is better qualified than Mr. Godwin to answer for himself, if he thought such idle observations entitled to any ; and what France, or the London Corresponding Society have to do with the Wansfeyan controverfy, unless for the purpose of eking out a book, but scantily furnished with better materials, I am really at a loss to conjecture.

As the Rowland contains no matter, that bears upon our argument, but what I have al-

ready had occasion to notice, or shall hereafter advert to, I should have passed it by, had it not contained a paragraph in the thirtieth page, too obnoxious to Rights of Discussion to be suffered to remain unanswered or uncensored. But before I quote that intolerant denunciation against the dissenters, I cannot help noticing the author's presumption, in venturing, in a note on page 32, to assert, that "*the Religion* of the "Presbyterians *consisted chiefly* in opposition to the "Church of England." Is this consistent with that charity, "which thinketh no evil, and hopeth all things?"

That the writer of the Rowland possesses considerable ability I readily admit; and am sorry that he should allude to, or adopt, any of the trifling criticisms in the *Strictures on Wansey's Letter*, by a Critic, or write so trifling a note as that in the thirty-seventh page: how easily might Wansey or his friend retort:

"This note, O Mister Doodle, is a note
Indeed, a note we never saw before!"

Such observations are as far from genuine criticism, as ridicule is from being a test of truth.

With

With respect to the religion of France, is the author of the Rowland to be informed, that true religion cannot with propriety be *geographically* christened, not being confined to either sect or country? Whatever opinion the Country Curate and the author of the Rowland may entertain of the present state of religion in France, they will find in a note, fo. 54. and 55. of a Picture of Christian Philosophy,* by Robert Fellowes, curate of Harbury, in Warwickshire, a book worthy to be praised, and recommended for the truly christian temper in which it is written, that it's serious and humble author thinks, with Wansey, in respect to the state of christianity in France, however widely he may differ from him on subjects of modern politics.

I shall now transcribe the objectionable paragraph, not without a hope that it's author will, upon due consideration, agree with me in the remarks I shall make on it.

“ *Are they not christians as well as yourselves,*
 “ *and full as diligent to approve themselves faith-*
 “ *ful followers of Jesus Christ?*” This God
 “ knows, but I am sure, *as long* as they are
 “ faithful

*Sold by the Publisher of this Pamphlet.

“ faithful followers of Jesus Christ, and *continue*
 “ *peaceable, and charitable, they will not be disturb-*
 “ *ed.*---Fo. 30.

Whether they are christians or not, is a question which must be referred to God alone ; but when we are told “ that so *long only* as they
 “ are faithful followers of Jesus Christ, and con-
 “ *tinue* peaceable, and charitable, they *will not*
 “ *be disturbed,*” I desire, on the behalf of the DISSENTERS to know, now papal infallibility is no more, to *whom* the power of judging of their hearts and conduct is to be trusted ; and by *whom* the scourge is to be wielded, that is to punish their infidelity or immorality.

If the menace contained in this paragraph were backed with *power*, the civil and religious rights of the dissenters would hang, indeed, on a precarious tenure ; and instead of enjoying themselves in peace, under the shadow of the Act of Toleration, every man, under his own vine, and under his own fig-tree, they would be in the situation of Damocles, and could not look up without seeing the flaming sword of persecution suspended by the cobweb thread of human fallibility.

What

What dissenters of various denominations might think being faithful followers of Christ, might be *deemed otherwise* by their adversaries : the peaceable professions of some amongst them might be construed as malignant symptoms of disaffection to what is called *a just and necessary war* ; and nothing would remain for them but to say in the words of David unto Gad, “ We “ are in a great strait—let us fall now into the “ hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great, “ and let me not fall into the *hand of man*.”

CHAP. VII.

A TWIG FROM A BROOM FOR THE CONVENTICLE, FOR THE USE OF IT'S AUTHOR.

“ Ecce iterum crispinus.”

“ Not a mouse

“ Shall disturb this hallowed house :

“ I am sent with BROOM before,

“ To sweep the dust behind the door.”

Shakespeare.

IF the author of this pamphlet had confined himself to answering the Apology for Village Preaching, I should have passed it over unnoticed, and the controversy on rites and ceremonies, and doctrinal matters ; being of opinion, that, on all such questions, every man is indisputably at liberty to think and decide for himself. But as the author of the pamphlet now under consideration, in his attempt to answer Mr. Kingsbury's apology, has adverted to the various replies and other publications on the Wansfeyan controversy, I shall make a few remarks on a pamphlet,

pamphlet, as much to be admired for the *modesty* of it's author, as for the liberality and *mild* spirit that it breathes throughout.

To establish the modesty of the author, I shall content myself with making a quotation from his work, which may be considered as a phenomenon, and, as I believe, *primæ impressionis* in the literary world.

Indeed no less an authority than *his own*, in the title page, could have induced a belief, that the following *high flown panegyric* on the remarks on Wansey's Letter, *by a Country Curate*, could have been written *by the Country Curate* himself.

“ A pamphlet, entitled, ‘Remarks on a Letter to the Bishop of Salisbury, by a Country Curate,’ led the *van of the defending party*, and appeared in a week from the publication of the Letter. It's *modesty* has been *universally admitted*, and the author's observations remain uncontradicted. It contains a Postscript, in which a few *smart expressions* are introduced, that were understood to be productive of much chagrin and uneasiness to Mr.

G

“ H.

“ H. W.’s friends. The *concluding irony*, from
 “ the calmness and moderation of the preceding
 “ pages, *was not immediately understood* by every
 “ reader ; but it soon produced the designed ef-
 “ fect, and the *humour* of the closing expressions
 “ was *universally admired*. The candid spirit of
 “ the Remarks gave pleasure to most of the
 “ readers ; and *all were satisfied of their truth*
 “ *and propriety.*”—*Broom* fo. 2.

If we had not the author’s own authority in support of such a fact, I should have considered it originating from wilful misrepresentation, or personal pique : as it is, I can only say, that the author, from a very natural partiality, seems to have formed an opinion of his *own work*, very different from most of his readers.

Such an unblushing testimony in his own praise, renders it unnecessary for me to animadvert on what he has said in the praise of others. We have heard in fable of a civil agreement of the long-eared brethren : “ Brother you scratch me, and I will scratch you ;” but for an author thus to scratch himself, is indeed out-heroding Herod.

When

When I turn to fo. 8. and to the note at the bottom of that page, if I had not been told in the title page, that the pamphlet was written by a clergyman, I should have considered it as the production of some over-bearing and presumptuous Tyro, in the school of Mendoza. Is it possible that a minister of the church could so far forget the decorum due to the character of a clergyman, as to tell the author of the Apology for Village Preaching, that “he ran the
 “risque of a BLOODY NOSE, or a whip through
 “the gullet?” a phrase as elegant as it is meek; and, “that perhaps he might think that his bodily weakness would protect him from the
 “CHALLENGE which *honour might adopt* to
 “chastise or correct the transgressions of his
 “mind?”—We may well exclaim,

“*Tantæne animis*

“*Celestibus iræ.*”

“And can *such wrath* in *priestly* bosoms dwell?”

That a clergyman in a *religious* controversy, should degrade himself to talk of challenges, bloody noses, and whipping through the gullet; and be rash enough to print it for his diocesan to peruse, to the grief of his brethren, and

triumph of those who are enemies to his holy calling !!!

O shame! where is thy blush! this is bringing more disgrace on his cloth than all Wansey's unguarded observations, and would almost induce one to believe that he might at least have seen *one* clergyman in a *scarlet coat*.

I cannot dismiss this subject, without venturing, on behalf of the author of the Appeal, on the authority of that zeal for religion that breathes through his work, to pronounce him incapable of adopting the sentiments imputed to him by this champion of the church, who, as he himself tells us, led the *van* of the defending army, but is now strangely thrown into the *rear* of it.

There is only one way that I can rationally account for his loss of temper; and that is, the repeated complaints that we find in both his pamphlets, of his own labours in the church being overlooked. I am sorry that "he should
 " have been the humble advocate of our religi-
 " ous establishment, without partaking of it's
 " honours or emoluments," and hope for his own sake only, that no part of his future conduct may betray a want of christian temper and
 forbear-

forbearance, in such glaring colours, as to render him unworthy of the patronage of his diocesan.

The note to page 49. is a proof of an observation that I have already made, that the obsolete Conventicle Act of Charles II. stands even to this day, to disgrace our statute-books; and that those dissenters who feel it their duty to preach, without a licence, first had and obtained, are within the grasp of it's power.

That they have just grounds to be alarmed for their peace and safety, the remainder of the note is sufficient evidence, as the Country Curate, therein suggests an improvement on Mr. Pitt's SEDITION ACT, that never occurred even to his *enlarged views of it's operation*; and that is to turn it into an engine of RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION against all dissenting congregations, where *more than forty-nine persons* are assembled together, *whatever their serious or ostensible motive may be.* “ Oh ! horrible ! most horrible ! ”

When I read such flaming passages, I should doubt whether I lived in the 18th century, did not the evidence of reason, and my senses convince me to the contrary. Such a spirit would

not

not have been overlooked in the bloody days of the bigot Mary, but will not, I trust, meet with much encouragement in the mild æra of the house of Brunswick.

To prove I do not wrong this author in thus charging him with a wish to stir up persecution against the dissenters, I will give the latter part of the note now under consideration, in his own words : “ By the late Sedition Act also, if more
 “ than forty-nine persons are assembled together, *whatever may be the pretended or ostensible motive*, without being legally convened,
 “ according to the directions of that act, any
 “ one or more, or even all of them, are liable
 “ to be imprisoned in the common goal, and to
 “ be tried at the public assizes of the county,
 “ on charges of sedition against the government.”

The impolicy of persecution stands recorded in the history of churches of all nations. The blood of martyrs hath, with great propriety and emphasis, been called the seed of the church. Our author has furnished us with another testimony of it's impolicy, in his note on the sixteenth page, in which he informs us, “ It
 “ is

“ is certain that at least TWENTY new meeting
 “ houses have been licensed in the diocese, in
 “ about THREE months, since the delivery of
 “ the charge, in addition to those FORTY which
 “ were alluded to by his Lordship.*” Such are
 the first fruits of the late charge against the
 dissenters.

To all those who are so narrow or ignorant, as to be advocates for coercion in matters of conscience, I will give an answer in the words of the great Earl of Mansfield,—words that ought to be written in capitals on every pulpit in the national or dissenting churches, and are worthy to be emblazoned in characters of gold, over the narrow gateways of spiritual courts, and over the consistorial chair of every chapter-house throughout the kingdom; “PERSECUTION *hath made* MARTYRS, *may make* hypocrites, “ but never yet made ONE CONVERT.”

The observation fo. 20. “ It is obvious that
 “ they reserve to themselves a right and authority
 “ rity to exercise their judgment and conscience
 “ in

*The account of the charge which was published in the Salisbury paper, does *not* mention the *number* of meeting houses that had been opened; to the authors of the Appeal and of the Broom, the dissenters are indebted for *many passages* in the charge, which would not otherwise have come to their knowledge.

“ in disobeying their superiors,” so far from being disreputable to the dissenters does, them the highest honour. Indeed none but advocates for the long exploded doctrines of *passive obedience*, can differ from them on that subject. I am proud to add many of their brethren of the national establishment, maintain the right of private judgment, with equal zeal. The blessings of civil and religious liberty, are too important to be tamely given up, whatever bigots may preach or tyrants dictate to the contrary.

Wansey's charge against the Bishop is further confirmed, in page 44. in capital characters. As I have quoted the passage in the introduction, it is unnecessary to restate it. If my readers will turn to the title page, they will find the Bishop of Sarum fully answered by that able writer, the Bishop of Landaff. When the former asserts that the efforts of his fellow labourers in the heavenly vineyard, are an existing evil, it is begging the question.

We agree that “ God is not the author of
 “ confusion but of peace.” but if the govern-
 ment of the christian world were to rest on the
 shoulders of these advocates, for intolerance and
 perfe-

persecution, the antient reign of night would be restored, and the interests and blessings of society lost in one chaotic mass of darkness, error, and cruelty.

The curious story about robbing a garden, may be well answered, by referring him to what the author of a Rowland for an Oliver has sensibly stated on the weight that stories are entitled to in a serious argument. And I could give our Country Curate a Rowland for his Oliver, were I not unwilling to rake into the ashes of an unfortunate clergyman, whose many eminent services in the cause of humanity, though they were not admitted (as thousands and tens of thousands thought they ought to have been) as an atonement for one rash action, ought at least to throw an oblivious veil over his unhappy fate.

It cannot be expected that I should attempt to follow our author through *his* book of *proverbs*. In quoting them, he is such a proficient, that the renowned governor of Baratania, Sancho Panza himself, were he now alive, and his loved *Dapple*, the Prize, must yield the palm of victory to the author of the Broom. As to the curious motto that he has taken from his own

work, I know not where he could have selected one more suitable to the coarse *gammon*, which he has lately dished up for the entertainment of the public.

The note, p. 17. is indeed “as *weak* as it is *wicked*.” I shall transcribe it verbatim, as it is too malignant to be passed over without severe observation.

“Does he wish to insinuate, that his Lordship’s powers of discrimination, are *as weak* or *wicked*, as those of some other persons on the State Trials at Maidstone?”

The *bitterness* and *violence* of party spirit in our day, is a disgrace to the times we live in. Every one who is in the least acquainted with the history of this country, or of our constitution, as established at the late revolution, must know, that, since that glorious æra, there has always been an opposition to the minister of the day; and those who wish well to the interests of their country would have much to regret, if there were not what is, and has been, properly called a *country party* in the House of Commons. Though this is a fact both *ins* and *outs* reciprocally admit, yet what is now the language

language of POLITICAL BIGOTRY, but, that those who lead or join the OPPOSITION, which they admit to be as *expedient*, as it is *constitutional*, must be *traitors* or *jacobins*.

In that spirit the note that I have last quoted is written. If I were the advocate of Mr. Fox, (whose *political ability* and *integrity* I most highly respect and venerate,) and of the present OPPOSITION, the circumstance I would select, in preference to any other, to do justice to their characters, and defend them against the misrepresentations and malicious calumnies that their opponents so scurrilously retail against them, should be their conduct on the late trials at Maidstone.

Those who are in the least acquainted with the operations of the human mind, will easily perceive, that if the leaders of the opposition had been in the *confidence* of the parties tried at Maidstone, they would have kept back from these trials, for fear of being implicated themselves in the same charge; their having volunteered so boldly, in what they had reason to judge the cause of innocence, (for God forbid that in this country a man should be prejudged before a verdict of a jury, however he may be

rashly called, an “acquitted felon,” after a jury of the country has found him not guilty,) is a full vindication to every mind capable of candour and alive to truth, that they are not tainted with the treasonable principles that have been so falsely and foully imputed to them. Contented therefore with being themselves innocent as doves, they leave the wisdom and venom of serpents to their calumniators and revilers, nor do they wish to possess the powers of discrimination ascribed by this reverend gentleman to his diocesan.

If such partizans wish that there should be but one opinion and one party in the country, they will find they have undertaken a work that they will not easily accomplish. If they be rash enough to press forward an appeal to Heaven, which Heaven forbid, they will find that the friends of civil and religious liberty may exclaim with the prophet, “They that be with us are more and mightier than they that be against us.”

The advocates for RIGHTS of DISCUSSION must not be hurt at being charged with “*sedition*,
“ privy conspiracy, and rebellion, with false doc-
“ trine,

“ trine, *heresy* and *schism*.” Upon such charges the author of christianity was crucified, his apostles martyred, and his faithful followers, in all ages, condemned to tortures, scaffolds, and flames, by the Domitian or Mary of their day. I cannot stronger illustrate this point than by reprinting part of that admirable passage from bishop Jewell, which is quoted in note, p. 49. and 50. of the Village Apology. This will not only save the Conventicle Sweeper the necessity of turning to “ his folio in the corner of “ his little library,” but be the means of conveying useful intelligence to those, who may not have access to so valuable a work.

“ They roar out,” says he, “ in all places, “ that we are *heretics*,—that we are wicked “ men,—that we despise all good actions,— “ that our business and design is the *subverting* “ *monarchies and kingdoms*,—that we have made “ a tumultuous defection from the catholic “ church, and have disturbed the quiet of the “ church by a detestable *schism*. In short, “ Tertullian saith, this was the general accusation against all christians in his time, that “ they were traitors, plotters, and the common “ enemies of mankind.”—*Bishop Jewell*.

In

It is to be regretted that priests should intermeddle with politics. No country has ever been improved by the interference of the church in matters of state. They should remember, who hath said, "My kingdom is not of this world:"

I cannot conclude this chapter better than by applying to the author that concluding application which he thought so peculiarly happy in Wansey's case :

" *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*"

" Stick to your wooden breeches."

" Every reader should know that" the author of a Broom for the Conventicle is a clergyman;* though from the *military texture of his cloth*, and the intolerance and bitterness of his spirit, were we to draw his portrait from that curious production, it would remind us of Wansey's story of the bishop of Beauvais; and if we sent the Broom for the Conventicle to his diocesan, this sentence should be written on it's cover, "Look, and see if this be *thy son's coat*, or no?"

CHAP.

* See the observation in the second line of the fourth page of the Broom.

CHAP. VIII.

THE APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

“ The only doubt is about the manner of their unity,
“ *how far* CHURCHES *are bound to be* UNIFORM *in their*
“ CEREMONIES.”

Hooker.

“ By RELIGION, I mean that general habit of reve-
“ rence towards the divine nature, whereby we are enabled
“ and inclined to worship and serve God, after *such a man-*
“ *ner as we conceive most agreeable to his will.*”

Wilkins.

THE Appeal to the People, having been quoted and referred to by most of Wansey's opponents, who seem to look up to it's author, as the champion of their church, I shall discuss it more at large, trusting my readers will approve of my conduct, in this respect, when they reflect, what an important feature the Appeal to the People forms in this controversy, and how much it is relied on by those who would narrow our Rights of Discussion.

Before

Before I proceed, I think it but justice to the author of the Appeal, to give him equal credit for his abilities and sincerity; and honor him for his zeal, whilst I cannot but regret that it is *zeal without knowledge*. I have heard he is young;—I wish him to live in the enjoyment of health and happiness 'till time has matured his judgment; and THAT LOVE, so emphatically recommended by the beloved Disciple, has enlarged and warmed his heart, to admit within the fold of our common shepherd, all those who hold Christianity in sincerity of spirit and purity of life, however they may differ about rites and ceremonies, or withhold their assent from creeds or articles, built upon the sandy foundation of human fallibility.

It is much to be lamented, that there is more bitterness of spirit in debates about religious differences than on any other subject. This proceeds from too pertinacious an adherence to shades of difference, in matters non-essential to salvation. For my own part, I am only anxious to promote that Religion, whose benign spirit tends to make men happy here, as well as to brighten their prospects for futurity; and, if a place for religious worship were wanted in my neighbourhood,
I would

I would as cheerfully subscribe to build a church as a meeting-house, or a meeting-house as a church; preferring only the comfortable erections of modern places of worship to the cold and damp structures of gothic or moorish architecture. It is also devoutly to be wished, that the practice of burying in churches, or having corse brought in and placed on biers before the reading-desk, (a practice very general out of London,) should be set aside; the one having a tendency to corrupt the air, and both being better calculated to inspire religious gloom than to raise our spirits to gratitude and praise.

But, indifferent as I am, whether I subscribe to build a church or a meeting-house, I would not carry my zeal for erecting either so far as a rector of a large parish in London did, at the time of the last great storm in Barbadoes, which not only threw down religious edifices, but left thousands without a home, or any adequate means of subsistence. Very large subscriptions were raised in England for the relief of our suffering fellow subjects with that promptitude which so strongly marks the benevolent character of the English nation. At a parochial meeting, held to consider the best mode of re-

I mitting

mitting subscriptions to the sufferers, the rector very seriously proposed, that the *first remittance* should be to rebuild the churches ! He was well answered that he thought very different from Christ on that point, who said, “ or what man “ is there of you, whom if his son ask for *bread* “ will he give him a stone?” *Matthew vii. v. 9.*

Our distressed brethren in Barbadoes, wanted houses, food, and cloathing, and the worthy rector was for sending them stones and masons, and fattening them on *steeple-paste*.

To return to the Appeal ;—whether praying or preaching should be *extempore* or *not*, and the very serious dispute, whether we should turn our faces to the East when we say the Apostles Creed, or sit or kneel at the communion-table, appears to me of as much importance as that mentioned in Gulliver’s Travels, whether we should break an egg at the wide or narrow end. I cannot but smile at the remark in page 15. respecting the *posture* of our Saviour’s body, at the institution of the sacrament. As the circumstance of our Lord’s being at *supper* is a strong presumption that Christ and his disciples were *sitting* ; for who ever heard of a party *sup-*
ping

ping on their knees! To obviate the force of an objection that he cannot answer, we are very gravely told, that “the Jews used a variety of gestures; however it is generally allowed probable that his *posture was inclining.*”

Though I am disposed to agree with the author of the Appeal, that a form of prayer is best adapted for worship in the family or the church, I am of opinion the secret breathings of the heart, in our closet or chamber, would be better expressed in the fervent spirit of extempore prayer. With respect to sermons, their being well studied and fairly transcribed is certainly the best mode of presenting them to a public audience: but the clergy should be so perfect in them, before they ascend the pulpit, as to give their written discourses, in the delivery, the impressive energies of extempore eloquence.

I am astonished that the author of the Appeal should be so unguarded, as to touch on frequent repetitions in prayer; a charge certainly more applicable to the church of England than to the dissenters. Our Lord said to his Disciples, “when ye pray, use no vain repetitions, as the heathens do.” how then must we lament

the vain repetitions of the responses in the litany; but, above all, the intolerable repetition of that most excellent form of prayer, the Lord's prayer, which, on Sundays, is repeated in the morning service not less than five times; and if any women are to be churched, and on other special occasions, much oftner. It is no answer to tell us, that these *were*, in days of Popery, separate services. Shall a reformed Protestant Church rely on a Popish manual for her defence?

Do those, who conform to the church of England, think with the Priests of Baal, that their god is talking, or pursuing, or on a journey, or sleeping, that he wants such frequent repetitions to awaken him? or, have they seriously considered, how often the name of the Lord is taken in vain, by the responses of "good *Lord* deliver us"—"We beseech thee to hear us good *Lord*," being put into the mouths of careless and inattentive persons.

The author of the Appeal will join me, in regretting, that many characters of that description form but too numerous a part of every congregation.

The

The Liturgy, considered as a human composition, is certainly admirable; but, as it's warmest advocates cannot deny that there are many things which want altering, why not set about it? Amongst other things, many of the lessons ought not to be read in a mixed congregation; if books, containing such passages as could be pointed out, would not be suffered to be read in any decent family, why should they be read in churches? There are many important truths, properly confided to matrons and adults, which it would be very indelicate to instil into the mind and ear of youth. I am not writing irreverently of the Bible, but condemning a practice in the church service, neither commanded nor warranted by the Scripture, and that ought to be corrected, for the sake both of morals and decorum.

I am shocked at the illiberality of the note in the 17th page. Has the author of the Appeal forgotten that our Lord was a carpenter's son? and perhaps his having made a plough himself, furnished him with that fine allusion against the drawing back of those who have put their hands to the evangelical plough? Has he forgotten that a toll-gatherer and fishermen were amongst Christ's

Christ's disciples? Does he not know that the great apostle of the Gentiles was a tent-maker, and worked at his business, that he might not be burthen some to his flock, not seeking *theirs but them*?—an example worthy the imitation of ministers of every persuasion, and especially in times like the present. He has reason to fear that the “poor have not the Gospel preached unto them;” and, without these blind leaders, as he is pleased to call them, that fear, I am persuaded, would be well founded.

Miserable indeed would be the state of the poor, if the learning of the schools was necessary to teaching or apprehending the one thing needful. Hath not Paul told us, that “God
 “ hath chosen the weak and foolish things of this
 “ world to confound the wise, and the weak
 “ things of this world to confound the things
 “ which are mighty.”

But “does not St. Paul command us to *obey*
 “ them who have the *rule over us*, and to be
 “ subject not only for wrath, but also for con-
 “ science sake?”—Certainly, in matters in
 which conscience is not aggrieved; but for
 conscience sake to sin against conscience would
 be

be to feed the kid in it's mother milk. If this position had been the rule of Paul's conduct he might have bowed down to idols, or have eaten meats sacrificed to idols, without tasting of the cup of martyrdom. Had this principle been adopted by our protestant reformers—had they obeyed the merciful Mary, who had *the rule over them*, faggots lighted up by *bigotry* would not have blazed in Smithfield. Had Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego bowed down to the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king, who *had rule over them*, had set up, they might have escaped the fiery furnace. And if the fires of persecution are now to be re-kindled, whatever furnace may be heated for conscientious dissenters of every denomination, if the bigots who condemn them to the flames choose, with Nebuchadnezzar, to gratify their uncharitable feelings with a cool view of the sufferings of such martyrs in the fiery furnace, I doubt not but they will find one supporting them in every trying ordeal, whose form will be like the form of the Son of God.

But who are those men against whose *delusions* we are *seriously warned*? The author of the Appeal himself tells us, in page 24, “ we all
worship

“ worship the same God, believe in the same
 “ Saviour, have the same baptism,” (whether administered to infants or adults) “ the same faith,
 “ the same hope, the same common interest ;
 “ most of us differ *only* in the *ritual part* of our
 “ worship.”

Then ought he not to wish them God-speed, and call upon his clerical brethren to contend with them in this labour of love, rather than calumniate their activity, or envy their success? Certainly, after such an admission by the author of the Appeal, it would be an unprofitable extravagance in these hard times, when the most rigid œconomy is indisputably necessary, to incur any expence in enforcing the obsolete acts that disgrace our statute books, or in providing church-wardens with *parochial whips*, *with bells* to them, to call dissenters to church, and flog those who, from conscientious motives, refuse to answer the ecclesiastical summons.

If, as we are told by the Appeal, page 24,
 “ where there is no law there is no transgression,” what solid reason can be given why dissenters should conform to the established church, as their consciences would condemn them if
 they

they did? Whether they *err* in judgment or not is immaterial; were they hypocritically to profess or conform to doctrines that their consciences disallow, they would be guilty before God. We are told by the prophet, “And an high way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it, but it shall be for those, *the way-faring men*, THOUGH FOOLS, shall not *err* therein.”—*Isaiah*, ch. xxxv. v. 8.

But alas! for the peace of society, “our thoughts are not as God’s thoughts, nor our ways as his ways.” The dissenters perfectly agree “that the Kingdom of God is not in rites or ceremonies, nor in meat and drink.” But to charge them, without any proof, with being “so extremely scrupulous and particular, respecting the external part of christianity, and with neglecting its essential duties, the duties of a righteous and holy life, of a peaceable spirit and conversation, as a numerous body of dissenters confessedly do,” (*App. p. 25.*) is indeed “sufficient to excite the pious indignation of every serious and well-disposed mind.” As to their resembling their hypocritical professors, assertion is no proof, and such

K

vague

vague charges might with equal propriety be retorted on the appellant.

That there exists but *one catholic church* I am ready to admit, and I have no doubt but that the Church of England forms a part of it. Having gone thus far, as a whole is made up of parts, I do not hesitate to affirm, that our dissenting brethren of every denomination, good Catholics, good Lutherans, good Calvinists, good Methodists, and good men of every Christian persuasion, form the glorious universal catholic church, which is lighted up by that Sun of Righteousness, who hath arisen with healing under his wings.

When we pass “ that bourne from whence no “ traveller returns,” we shall drop our *party-coloured surnames* with our mortal parts in the grave, and our *Christian* name, Good, will be our passport to the heavenly mansions. The following story is so applicable to this observation that I hope my readers will be pleased with my inserting it :

“ An *itinerant* protestant preacher once
 “ knocked at father Abraham’s door—pray,
 “ father

“ father Abraham, said the preacher, what is
 “ the sect most numerous in Heaven? are there
 “ any methodists there?—No, no methodists.
 “ Any presbyterians?—No. Any quakers?—
 “ No. None but protestants?—I never saw a
 “ protestant there, replied father Abraham.
 “ What no protestants?—None. Then there
 “ are no good men in Heaven?—Yes, good
 “ men there are in plenty, *but none but good*
 “ *men*, was the answer of father Abraham.”*

The author of the Appeal suffers himself to
 be carried away by a zeal that, however sincere,
 is certainly not only without knowledge, but
 what is worse, *without charity*, when he says
 that “ the real object of the dissenters is *not re-*
 “ *ligious*, but *political* ;” talks of “ undeceiving
 “ the deluded multitude, and stripping off their
 “ hypocritical veil ;” or ventures to assert, that
 “ their increasing numbers justly create an
 “ alarm for our present constitution; that what-
 “ ever difference of opinion may arise amongst
 “ them on the subject of religion, they are

* See an excellent little tract, entitled Emigration to
 America, just published by Thomas Clio Rickman, Upper
 Mary-le-bone Street, price 1s. 6d.

“ united in the same *inveterate hatred* against
 “ *regal as well as episcopal* government; and
 “ that they inculcate sentiments of *sedition and*
 “ *treachery* on uneducated minds.”

I am shocked at the rashness of a young man in venturing to make such unfounded and illiberal charges, as tend to involve the fortunes and lives, and what is dearer than both to every honest man, the characters of our dissenting fellow-subjects in one indiscriminate mass of ruin and infamy; and I cannot but feel with horror that, whilst such accusations are urged against them, with all the bitterness of political and religious bigotry, if dissenters of every denomination had *but one neck*, a Nero would not be wanting to strike off their heads at one blow.

“ If the crime of SCHISM will condemn us,
 “ as Saint Paul asserts, (*Gal. V. 19, 20.*)
 “ equally with the crimes of *idolatry* and *mur-*
 “ *der*, it follows, it is both criminal and dan-
 “ gerous to communicate with schismatics,
 “ and, consequently, *with all dissenters.*”—*App.*
fo. 27.

I have

I have heard of the Scriptures being too often used as a nose of wax, and bent to accommodate the *party spectacles* through which they are to be read; but that the author of the Appeal, after telling us that *schism* will condemn us equally with *idolatry* or *murder*, should venture to refer us to a scriptural authority, wherein *schism* is *not even mentioned*, would scarcely be credible, if it were not in the power of every one, by turning to *Gal. V. v. 19, 20*, to ascertain the fact.

If the author of the Appeal mean to shelter himself under a criticism on the word *αἰρεσεις*, I answer, that when he referred to a passage in Scripture he ought to have quoted it *as it stands*, and not as he is pleased to explain it. What must become of the poor and the unlearned if a *critical* knowledge in the *Greek* language is necessary to the understanding aright of those Scriptures which are to make us wise unto salvation.

With the criticism on the word *αἰρεσεις* I by no means agree. Paul certainly was sufficiently learned to express himself with accuracy, without any correction from the author of the Appeal, or from the author of a marginal note
in

in the quarto Bible, published at the Clarendon Press, on *Cor.* I. ch. xi. v. 18. wherein the apostle hath told us “ I hear there be *divisions* among you,” “ or SCHISMS” saith the writer of the note to which I now allude.

Did I not know that there is a petition in the Liturgy, calling on Heaven to deliver us from schism, which, like heresy and blasphemy, is a charge of a very indefinite and fluctuating nature, what is *schism*, *heresy*, or *blasphemy*, in one age or country, being *pure orthodoxy* in another, I should be astonished at such an attempt to persuade us that heresy and schism are synonymous terms. I appeal to the ear of every English reader whether HERESIES does not in its very *sound* come nearer to AIRESEIS than *schism*. The fact is, if we look into a Greek Lexicon we shall find their meanings to be *very distinct*, αἰρεσεις from αἰρεω, capio eligio being the act of the mind, in chusing or selecting, and σχισματα from σχισω findo, scindo, dissecō, applying to *corporal* dissection, and so we find Paul using it, 1 *Cor.* ch. xii. v. 25. “ That “ there should be no *schism in the body* ;” whereas, when he speaks of differences in matters of *opinion only*, he very critically discriminates, by
calling

calling them not *schisms*,* but *divisions* or heresies.

“ When Saint Paul believed himself bound
 “ to persecute the Christians ; let me ask, was
 “ his persecution sinful, or not ? Sinful it assuredly was.” (*App. p. 23.*) And a very good lesson this assuredly is for the author of the Appeal, and all those who are stirring up persecution to take into their most serious consideration, always remembering that they are at least *as liable as Saul was* to be *mistaken* in this matter.

Did she (meaning the established church) indeed require “ us to profess any false doctrine,
 “ or to commit any action, plainly repugnant
 “ to the divine law, it would become us, as
 “ sincere and well-disposed Christians, to withdraw from her service. But as the contrary
 “ is confessedly the fact, we are bound, by the

* Having demonstrated that Paul did not use the word schism in the sense in which it is now understood, to prevent any quibbling or confusion about words, whenever I mention schism I use the word in its modern acceptation.

“ same

“ same rule of conscience, to observe constant
 “ communion with her.”—*App. p. 28.*

Is the author aware that the *established kirk* of Scotland is composed of those whom he calls dissenters—he will not be so rash as to charge the kirk of Scotland, or any dissenting church amongst us that is built on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, with “ professing any
 “ false doctrine, plainly repugnant to the divine
 “ law.” Let him then answer this plain question—If he were to be fixed in Scotland, would he *conform* to the established kirk, or be himself a *dissenter*? and if his conscience would not suffer him to conform, why should he call upon our dissenting brethren to do that which he would not do himself, if he were placed in the same situation, with respect to the kirk of Scotland, in which they stand with respect to the church of England.

“ I maintain then syllogistically, that if conformity be at one time legal, it is *under similar*
 “ *circumstances* always legal; and that it is
 “ sometimes legal is proved by the conduct of
 “ the

“ the dissenters themselves, who do occasionally communicate.”—*App. p. 28.*

It ill becomes an advocate for the Test Act to reproach dissenters for *occasional conformity*. Unless they submit to such conformity, the Test Act excludes them from acting in situations which, as men and Christians, it is their duty to aspire to. What then is to be done? Shall they wave their scruples, in obedience to a positive law of the land, in matters not essential to salvation, or shall they shut themselves out from filling up their proper stations in society? If they err in this matter, it will be required at their hands who throw this stone of stumbling in their way.

But because they occasionally communicate with the church, they ought always to communicate. I deny the inference. It is true, that “ if conformity be at one time legal, it is “ always legal under *similar circumstances*,” and cannot, on this author’s own admission, be legal in dissimilar situations.

Has the author of the Appeal forgotten what Paul has said on this head? *1 Cor. ch. vi. v. 12.*

L

“ All

“ All things are *lawful* unto me, but all things
 “ are not *expedient*; all things are *lawful* for
 “ me, but I will not be brought under the power
 “ of any.”

To maintain that what we do at one time we ought to do at all times, is as false in logic as it is in theology. Physic may occasionally be expedient for us, but are we therefore always to live on physic? We may do some good in society by submitting occasionally to the inconveniencies of dining at a public feast, or to the ceremonious parade of a formal visit; are we therefore to give up the comforts of our own table and fire-side, or to yawn life away in the ennui of a drawing-room? It may be both legal and expedient for a man to ride in armour at the king's coronation or at the mayor's shew in London—how miserable would his lot be were he doomed never to doff his armour, but to strut the pageant of a raree-show all his days?

It is not true that the presbyterians brought Charles I. to the scaffold, whatever Goldsmith in his History of England, the author of the Appeal, the Country Curate, or Mr. Brian Monckhouse, may have asserted to the contrary.

It

It is evident from history, that the presbyterians not only injured themselves with Cromwell for their bold attempts to save the first Charles, but their brethren in Scotland brought ruin on themselves, and the vengeance of Cromwell on their country, by their efforts to restore his unprincipled son. Mr. Brian Monckhouse has himself informed us, *from Goldsmith's History!!!* “ that the presbyterians “ longed for nothing so ardently as the *king's* “ *restoration*; that joined to the royalists, they “ formed a decisive majority on every contest; “ and without noise, but *with steady resolution*, “ determined to *call back the king*.”—Page 36 of *Mr. Monckhouse's Letter to Mr. Kingsbury*.

After the admission of such important facts as these, the illiberal motives imputed to them by Goldsmith or any other individual will weigh little with a discerning and impartial public. Their very adversaries have borne testimony to their loyalty, and by a quotation from their favourite historian, have knocked down the *mud* walls which they had waded through so much dirt to erect. I am sorry to be under the necessity of adding, that the only proof of royal gratitude they received from the king after
his

his restoration was the passing of an act that threw about 2000 of their most able ministers out of church benefices, which, to their immortal honour, they sacrificed upon motives purely conscientious. But admitting, for argument sake, that the dissenters in that *remote* period were enemies to royalty, is that a ground for calumniating the dissenters of the *present day*? Such a mode of reasoning proves too much, and tells against those who bring it forward.

The clergy of the national church were papists in the reign of Henry VII. half reformed in the reign of Henry VIII. protestants in the reign of Edward VI. and persecutors of protestants in the reign of his successor. Would it not be uncharitable and illiberal in the extreme to infer from thence, that because they had turned with the courtly tide in times past, that if a papist *, by any stretch of power, were, at any future period, to reign in this country, that they would *turn once more*? The conclusion in both cases rests precisely on the same ground, and it is as fair to draw such an inference against the national church, as it is to impute

* Without an usurpation a papist could not ascend the throne of these kingdoms, being barred by the Act of Settlement.

impute disloyalty to the dissenters in our day, on no better argument or evidence than that fanatics were enemies to royalty in the time of Charles the First.

There is a most striking fact in our national history, too honourable to the dissenters, to have been overlooked by a candid or impartial historian ; but bigotry may be compared to the jaundice, and we are told all seems yellow to the jaundiced eye.

The fact I allude to is the truly disinterested sacrifice the dissenters made of their own interests in the reign of James the Second, by refusing to accept of toleration from such a prince, at such a time, as they knew the toleration held out to them, was only intended as a cloak to sanction Popery and introduce despotism. James the Second had "rule over them;" but had they not resisted him for conscience sake, the House of Brunswick would not have ascended the British Throne. It is easy to charge a body of people with disloyalty and sedition, but the noble instance I have just alluded to, and their tried attachment in the worst of times to the HOUSE OF HANOVER, and to the Constitution,

as established at the revolution, are testimonies in their favour, too strongly grounded to be overturned by any blast, however violent, from the ram's horn of bigotry.

CHAP. IX.

RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION ASSERTED, AND DISSENTERS OF EVERY DENOMINATION VINDICATED, WITH FREE THOUGHTS ON SCHISM, AND UNIFORMITY OF WORSHIP.

“ Truth cannot be found without some labour, and intention of mind, and the thoughts dwelling a considerable time upon the survey, and DISCUSSION of each particular.”

South.

“ ROME never *arrogated* to herself any *infallibility* but what she PRETENDED to be founded on Christ’s promise.”

Tillotson.

NOTHING can exceed the rashness of man, a being *liable to error*, in pretending to a right to tell his fellow mortals how they shall think on religious subjects, and with what offerings they shall approach the temple of God.

As no man can answer for another’s soul, no man can have a right to dictate to another in matters
of

of conscience. We are commanded to “ prove
 “ all things, and hold fast that which is good,”
 and “ to give a reason for the faith that is in
 “ us :” but how are we to prove, or reason on
 any proposition, without consideration and dis-
 cussion? and what advantages could result from
 the exercise of our *reasoning* powers, if we were
 under the necessity of conforming to any propo-
 sitions or creeds that our judgments held to be
 erroneous, I am at a loss to comprehend.

What *security* can men, who are for imposing
 creeds and articles on the consciences of others,
 give to those, to whom they would dictate in
 such matters, that *they themselves* may not be in
an error, unless they arrogate the attribute of *in-*
fallibility, which belongs to God alone?

That general councils have erred in things
 pertaining to God, and that Christian churches
 have also erred, is admitted in the nineteenth
 and twenty-first articles of the Church of Eng-
 land :—“ As the Church of Jerusalem, Alex-
 “ andria, and Antioch, have erred ; so also the
 “ Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their
 “ living and *manner of ceremonies*, but also in
 “ *matters of faith.*” — Art. 19. *Book of Common*
Prayer.

Prayer. A declaration that might be placarded on the doors of every church that stands on the basis of human authority.

In doubtful propositions we are justly informed by Locke, that “ the opinions of others, whom “ we know and think well of, are *no ground* “ *of assent.*”

Our Lord hath commanded us to “ judge “ not, lest we be judged.” Let us hear what Paul saith to those, who presume to judge their brethren: “ Who art thou that judgest ano- “ ther man’s servant ? to his own master he “ standeth or falleth ; yea, he shall be holden “ up, for God is able to make him stand.”

“ One man esteemeth one day above ano- “ ther ; another esteemeth every day alike ; let “ every man be FULLY PERSUADED in *his own* “ *mind.*”—*Rom. xiv. v. 4. 5.*

As we cannot will to believe, should we be better men, or Christians, for an hypocritical profession or conformity ?

M

If

If we have imbibed a religious persuasion, erroneous or not, which we, in our consciences, believe to be true, what prince or prelate hath a right to charge penal laws, or fulminate excommunications and spiritual censures on our heads, for thinking, judging, and believing for ourselves, instead of pinning our faith upon the sleeves of others? Perhaps we may be told, that it is not for thinking for ourselves, but for promulgating our opinions, that we fall under the lash of the law, or censures of the church. If we believe the opinions that we have formed to be of importance to the happiness of society here or hereafter, it is our bounden duty to inculcate them on every occasion; and any law to restrain us from so doing, or to compel us to adopt the opinions of others, in matters of conscience, is treason against the rights of conscience, and an impious usurpation on the prerogative of Heaven.

Only admit such a law, and the Jews were justified for their conduct towards our Saviour. Only act on such a principle, and systems of false religion must go blundering on from age to age. If Christ had submitted to such a law, Judaism would have remained unshaken, and our modern
 protestant

protestant or catholic Popes would have wanted a creed to ram down the throats of others.

To a national church, as a *mere political establishment*, I do not object, provided it doth not assume the power of compelling any man to assent to it's doctrines, or subscribe to it's articles, or of punishing those who are dissenters in any respect whatever, and who are honest enough to think and judge for themselves; but although I am indifferent whether there be such an establishment or not, I cannot help thinking, that, if we look into the church history of all creeds and countries, national churches have ever been intolerant and persecutive. The national church of the Jews crucified Jesus Christ; and the national church of Rome hath filled the earth with Christian blood. Philosophy hath also to regret the death of victims in the cause of *free enquiry*; and, but for the liberality of better times, a Locke and a Newton had shared the fate of a Galileo.

In Holland, whilst it was independent of France, they had no established church; in America they have none, yet religion is seriously attended to, though not enforced by the sword

sword of the civil magistrate. Christ and his apostles planted the universal catholic church, not only without a secular arm to back them, but in spite of the bitterness and persecution which the constituted authorities of the Jewish and Pagan churches stirred up against them.

But the church of England is a reformed and pure church, and therefore schism from such a church must “ be a dangerous error, if not a “ damning sin.” The church of England is, in that respect, in the same situation as other churches that have preceded it ; and unless it arrogate to itself infallibility, would be as weak and wicked in an attempt to force its creeds and doctrines on the souls of others, if there be but the *remotest possibility* that such doctrines may be erroneous.

It is astonishing that such an argument concerning schism should be brought forward at the close of the 18th century. What are the protestant doctrines but schisms from the church of Rome ? What are the doctrines of Christianity but schisms from the Jewish synagogues and Heathen temples ? To say the church of England stands on higher ground than the Jewish church

church stood on in our Saviour's days is not warranted by the fact. The Bible tells us, that the Jewish church was planted by God himself. When Jeſus Chriſt preached againſt that church, and propheſied that not one ſtone of their temple ſhould be left remaining upon another, he preached up ſchiſm and ſedition againſt the Jewish church and government. When he would not be diverted from his courſe for fear of Herod. it proves that he did not reſpect the perſon of a *wicked* king, who “ had rule over him.” Were he now on earth, and to preach againſt the corruptions of modern churches and ſtates, he would moſt probably be charged with ſedition, hereſy, and ſchiſm.

Who introduced ſchiſms from Judaiſm into an apoſtolical church but the great apoſtle of the Gentiles ? and that not in matters of indifference, but in points of firſt-rate conſequence; ſuch as exploding cuſtoms that had prevailed for ages, by beating down the *ceremonial* partition wall between Jew and Gentile, and ſetting aſide a ſolemn ordinance that had been inſtituted by God himſelf.

Paul

Paul was not more nice in his respect towards his elder brother in the church; for when he found the apostle Peter trimming between Jewish rites and Christian liberty, he tells us himself that he boldly “withstood him at Antioch to his face.”

That Paul authorized the rights of discussion and vindicated dissenters of his day is evident from his precepts and example. When the primitive church was agitated about some points, as important as those that now form some of the shades of opinion and matters in debate between established churches and dissenters, Paul asserted the right of private judgment, saying, “He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day unto the Lord, he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.” —*Rom. xiv. v. 6.*

Paul was not only an advocate for religious but for civil rights. He knew how to assert the privileges of a Roman citizen, and when he had been unjustly scourged and imprisoned, told the

the magistrates, who had gone beyond *the vigour of the law*, “ They have beaten us openly
 “ UNCONDEMNED, BEING ROMANS, and have
 “ cast us into prison, and now do they thrust
 “ us out *privily*? nay, verily, but let them
 “ come themselves and fetch us out.” He also
 was accused by the interested bigots of his day
 with stirring up heresy and sedition, and boldly
 avowed before Felix, that after the way which
his accusers called HERESY worshipped he the
 God of his fathers.

Without rights of discussion philosophy had
 never availed itself of the labours of a Coper-
 nicus or of the genius of a Newton, and Henry
 the Eighth’s bloody act of the six articles and
 laws against witchcraft had yet remained unre-
 pealed. Shut out the light of discussion from a
 church, and what remains but a dark and stu-
 pendous mass?

Monstrum horrendum informe ingens cui lumen ademptum,
Virgil.

I have always considered human attempts to
 enforce uniformity in worship, a renewal of the
 fabled war of the giants against Heaven.

After

After the answer that was given by Christ to the woman of Samaria, "The hour cometh
 " when ye shall neither *in this Mountain*, nor
 " yet *at Jerusalem* worship the Father," it is astonishing that such a stress should be laid on church conformity, the place where we assemble to celebrate divine service being altogether immaterial, so that we worship God in spirit and in truth.

The author of the Appeal inveighs against schism, and preaches up passive obedience, raking into the ashes of the rump parliament for materials to calumniate the dissenters. Has he forgotten how many of his own cloth were schismatics, and *nonjuring dissenters* from their own church at the æra of the revolution? Or will he not remember how many priests adhered to the priest-ridden despot that stole away from the throne, and persisting in their disobedience to those who had a *right to rule over them by the best of all titles, the WILL and CONSENT of the PEOPLE*, refused to take the oaths of allegiance to his immediate successors, and to the family now upon the throne?

I have

Whilst I write thus, let me not be misunderstood. I honour those amongst them, who refused the oaths for conscience sake, as much as I esteem those learned and good men, who, choosing rather to sacrifice their livings than their principles, were cast out of the church for NON-CONFORMITY.

We are told by the beloved Disciple, *Rev. xix. v. 12.* that on the head of Christ “ *were many crowns* ;” but modern bigotry would not allow him more than *one crown*, nor liberty to wear it out of the *narrow* walls of it’s own church.

If we look into the human countenance we find infinite variety of feature and expression. If we look abroad into the works of creation, we find no dull line of uniformity, but all that is great and beautiful happily blended and relieved ; hill and valley, land and water, earth and heaven, forming one glorious whole ; and the sweet incense of gratitude ascending daily in infinite variety of notes and sounds from all created beings, to the first and best of Beings.

N

I have

I have read somewhere of an eastern despot, who, like our Norman Nimrods, laid whole towns and villages waste, not to make him a chase, but to build him a palace. After many years of painful labour, in which the lives of thousands had fallen beneath the weight of their burthens in the heat of a burning climate, and millions upon millions had been drained from his royal treasury, and by rapacious tax-gatherers from his impoverished subjects, he gave a royal feast in honour of having finished what he thought a stupendous work. The courtiers being assembled, he opened his royal ears, expecting to be gorged with the sweet notes of flattery. The grand vizier put the ball of adulation in motion, and after having made the accustomed number of prostrations in the dust, burst forth, "Hail, great and mighty Sultan! "magnificent, and glorious, and wonderful, "is the palace that thou hast built; live "for ever to inhabit it!" The sultan graciously raising his prostrate vizier, turned to the holy musti, who also made his due prostrations; but his sovereign was not a little chagrined to receive the *same* compliment in the *very same* words; however, upon considering that the holy musti's thoughts might be wholly

wholly abstracted, and occupied upon spiritual subjects, he applauded him for his discretion in following so good an example as that set him by his loyal vizier. But what words can express his surprize and indignation, when he found that, although his courtiers could vie with each other in bowing as low, and as often as the vizier or the musti, they could not rise to a *new* compliment.—“ Unhappy prince that I “ am,” said he, with self condemning conviction, “ to have spent the prime of my life, “ exhausted my funds, destroyed thousands of “ my subjects, and made their habitations desolate “ to build a palace, which cannot furnish more “ than one *monotonous* echo of homage and ad- “ miration !” The inference is obvious ; if an eastern despot was thus disgusted, who shall presume to prescribe *uniformity* in the worship that we offer unto the King of kings ?

Uniformity is like the *iron bed* on which Procrustes, an antient tyrant, commanded all his guests to be laid ; if their feet were too short, inquisitorial pullies racked and stretched them to the due length ; if they were too long, the knives of his high priests lopped these human sacrifices to this iron standard : and where uni-

formity of worship has been prescribed in the Christian world, how many have been stretched by the Procrustes of the church on the iron bed of persecution, if their principles, like those of our protestant reformers, went too far, for bigotry to lop them, and bind them to the stake ; if they were too short, and could not stretch so wide as to swallow transubstantiation, or papal or other human infallibility, bring out the racks, and screw their agonizing limbs to the established standard. Human nature recoils at the painful recollection of how many thousands have groaned, and expired unheard and unknown in inquisitorial cells, or have been stretched for conscience sake on this iron bed, after it had been sufficiently heated by the faggots of intolerance, to send the spirits of these just men made perfect, through suffering, like Elijah, in fiery cars, to that Heaven where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are for ever at rest.

I accept of toleration in matters of conscience, as I would accept a gift of *part* of my estate from the strong arm of power which had wrested the whole from me. I am thankful for what I have

have received, without waving my inalienable and unanswerable right to the recovery of the whole.

I remember what the late Earl of Guildford said when he was in the House of Commons on the subject of parliamentary reform—"As a stand must be made some where against these innovations and claims, I will make my stand at the very first point of defence." Though I could not agree with him in his sentiments on the subject of a parliamentary reform, yet there was great wisdom in what he said, thinking as he thought; so in respect to liberty of conscience, a stand must be made some where. If we wish to preserve our rights, the first point of attack ought to be our point of defence—those who are for temporizing will injure their cause, without conciliating their opponents. I build Rights of Discussion, not on toleration from man, but on the broad bottom of the true Magna Charta that I received from God, when he endowed me with rational faculties, and gifted me with immortality; and I deny the right of any man or description of men to interfere in matters of conscience in any form or on any pretence whatever. Whilst I claim
these

these privileges for myself, I certainly wish most earnestly to have them extended in their most unlimited sense to others. It is the duty of all men to think seriously, decide coolly, and with sincerity and boldness to act up to what they believe for themselves, and not to trust their souls to the dogmas of others.

I do not believe uniformity in worship to be the mind or will of God. It is more suited to the temple of the great Diana of the Ephesians, than to the universal catholic church of Christ. We are told by Christ, that in his father's house are many mansions; and in those mansions I hope to meet with those who now differ from me so widely, and so warmly in these points. There we shall know what we have been told, that God is love, and wonder how we could have been so lost in error whilst on earth, as to have adopted the monstrous idea of doing God service by hating or persecuting each other.

Those who are for rekindling the fires of persecution should remember they may be scorched by its flames. They who threw Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego into the fiery furnace, were themselves consumed by the heat that had

no power over those victims of intolerance. When that great and good man, Archbishop Cranmer, condemned Lambert, he little thought that he himself should be condemned to suffer for the same doctrines. Persecutors may think to approach the Redeemer in the last day in the bold manner of some of old: Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast nonconformists out of the church; and in thy name imprisoned quakers and conventiclers, and delivered over heretics, bound hand and foot, to the secular arm? And have we not in thy name deluged the earth with the blood of the bold champions of free enquiry and rights of discussion? but will not our Lord say unto them, Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you? for not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter my kingdom, but he that doeth the will of my Father, by acting up to the golden rule that I have prescribed, of doing unto others as ye would that they should do unto you.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

HINTS FOR PASTORAL CHARGES.

“ Only add

“ Deeds to thy knowledge answerable ; add faith,

“ Add virtue, patience, temperance ; add love,

“ By name to come called CHARITY, *the soul*

“ *Of all the rest.*”

Milton.

IT would exceed the limits of a pamphlet were I to enter largely on the many hints that might be introduced into this chapter with great propriety. I shall content myself with selecting a few subjects intimately connected with the best interests of society, and the manners and happiness of the rising generation.

In venturing to suggest topics for Pastoral Charges it is far from my intention to offend any one. Public good is my object, and every worthy Christian Pastor will be thankful for good advice, from whatever quarter it may come.

MELIORATION OF THE CONDITION OF THE
INFERIOR CLERGY.

“ His scanty salary compelled him to run deep in debt for
“ a new gown, and cassock : and now and then forced him
“ to write some paper of wit or humour ; or preach a
“ sermon for ten shillings, to supply his necessities.”

Swift.

IF the Heads of the National Church wish to counteract the activity of the Dissenters, not in the spirit of bitterness or strife, but of love and zeal in the cause of their common master, much must depend on the respectability, conduct, and character of the inferior Clergy ; for with them the cure of souls, generally speaking, chiefly rests. To promote this great end, it is necessary they should have their stipends raised to enable them to live decently, and mix on equal terms amongst their parishioners.

We live in an age which is but too much influenced by appearances ; if the Rector or Vicar, does not respect his Curate, by shewing him kindness, how can he expect that the Laity should shew that respect which he him-

self with-holds, or that the Squire, or the Gentry of the Parish, should ask the poor Curate to their tables, when there is no seat reserved for him at the table of his inconsiderate, or haughty Vicar? It is the duty therefore of the dignified Clergy, to lay this matter seriously to heart, and when assembled at a visitation, let a committee of the most liberal and respectable men amongst them, be appointed to inquire into the state of the inferior Clergy, in every diocese, and let them contribute largely, according to the benefices they hold in the Church, to increase a fund, to be applied by such committee, to raise the incomes of the Curates in every diocese, to such a stipend, as would enable them to maintain themselves and families, on some footing of respectability.

If Bishops, instead of sounding an alarm against their dissenting brethren, would *charge* their Clergy to promote so good a work, and enforce it by subscribing liberally themselves, we trust so noble an example would be as nobly acted up to, by the beneficed Clergy.

This, till something better could be done to make a *permanent provision* for the melioration
of

of the condition of the inferior Clergy, would enable them to live with some degree of comfort, and to conciliate the esteem and friendship of their respective parishioners.

TYTHES.

“ Sometimes comes she with a *little pig's tail*,

“ Tickling the Parson as he lies asleep,

“ Then dreams he of *another Benefice*.”

Shakespeare.

TYTHES are not only generally felt by the agricultural interest, as an intolerable and growing burthen, but as a tax on industry. If the rights of those who claim an interest in them, could be secured, in either form, the abolition of Tythes would be an improvement that would give a new face to the bounty, and put an end to jealousies and heart burnings, that are pregnant with ills incalculable.

It has been rumoured, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer intends providing for the

Church at their present establishment, and applying the surplus of the Tythes for national purposes. If he has such a plan in view, he will not be deterred by any cry of *Innovation*, or *Church in Danger*, from pursuing his purpose, however soon a small outcry might startle him in the matter of *parliamentary Reform*, or any other cause that he had not equally at heart. It would therefore become the Church, if such a measure should be brought forward, to convince the Nation that they are also willing to make their sacrifice, in this hour of national pressure. Whether the plan is intended to be brought forward, or whether it be practicable or not, is not our province to determine, but, considering Tythes as a tax upon improvements, restraint on agriculture, and a source of endless contention between the Clergy and their parishioners, if an adequate provision were made for them, who are now entitled to demand and receive them, their abolition would certainly be productive of national and moral good. But whilst we look forward in hope of their speedy abolition, let the Clergy in the mean time, give the turn against themselves, in all questions concerning Tythes, where it can be done with propriety, not only
by

by way of an example of self denial to their parishioners, but also upon this censor, that as they are at no expence for manure or labour, sowing or reaping, if they have a Tythe of the Harvest, it vastly exceeds a *tenth* of the whole, which is all they profess to claim, and for this reason whilst Tythes rest on their present footing, considering the improved state of horticulture and agriculture, the beneficed Clergy can afford, without injury to themselves or families, to augment the stipends of those who labour in the discharge of their parochial duties.

DISCOURAGEMENTS TO MATRIMONY.

“ If that thy bent of love be honourable,
 “ Thy purpose marriage, send me word, *to-morrow.*”
Shakespeare.

“ Chloe blind to wit and worth,
 “ Weds the *rich dulness* of some son of earth.”
Pope.

ONE great source of the immorality of the present day, is the general discouragement to young people's entering early into the married state

state. This proceeds from various causes, and is a root of bitterness that produces moral evils, which go to the ruin of estate, body, and mind.

Many of its causes are not within the power of the clergy to controul; but there are two points that are proper subjects for pulpit animadversion.

Is it not notorious, that when servants apply to be hired, a common question is, are you married? If answered in the affirmative, they are told, no, that their being married, is an insuperable objection, and what are the consequences? Those who are not married, whatever follies youth and passion may hurry them into, steer clear of matrimony; whilst many who have entered on that state, having no honest means of procuring their livelihood, or bringing up their families, plunder the community of which they might have been useful members, and atone with their lives for crimes which they have been driven to commit,

Another discouragement to matrimony is, a taste for Smithfield bargains. It is much to be wished that there should be money on one
side,

side, although there may be much happiness without it ; and in the lower orders of society, if love blesses the cottage, moral and industrious habits are sufficient for national happiness.

These two grounds of discourse to entering into the married state, viz. refusing to hire married servants, and the spirit of Smithfield bargains in marriage contracts, it is in the power of the clergy and incontestibly it is their duty, to live and preach down.

DUELLING.

“ Why 'tis a boisterous and a cruel stile ;

“ A stile for challengers.

Shakespeare.

WHATEVER false notions of honour may be entertained to the contrary, Duelling is not only against the law of the land, but altogether incompatible with the spirit and precepts of Christianity.

Christ

Christ commands us and enjoins us, in his celebrated Sermon on the Mountain, to love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitefully use us ; and said to Peter, when he drew his sword in his Master's defence, " Put
 " up again thy sword into his place, for all they
 " that take the sword, shall perish with the
 " sword."

Were it a certainty in all duels, that the offending party would fall or suffer, something might be said as to the *satisfaction* obtained by a duel, however objectionable duelling may be in other respects ; but is not the fact the very reverse of this ?*

If a man injure me even in the most tender point, by defaming the character or violating the virtue of my wife, my daughter, or my sister, what satisfaction can it be to take the blood of a villain at the hazard of my own life ? He may have the effrontery, with the rake in the Provoked Husband, to say, " Sir, I
 wear

* Is it not as probable that the injured party may fall as his opponent ? And is it not then gross nonsense to talk of the *satisfaction* of a duel ?

“ wear a sword,” and be so hardened and unblushing as to wish to sheath it in the heart’s blood of a man whom he hath already irreparably injured ; but will that justify me in being *accessary* to my own murder ? or in leaving those who have a claim on me for protection without a guardian, when the very fact for which I am to demand satisfaction proves how much they may stand in need of a *protector* ?

What can justify a father of a numerous family in setting his life on the hazard of a dye ? and what can justify a Minister of a great nation, in exposing the weighty concerns entrusted by his Sovereign to his charge, to the confusion in which a well-directed ball might have involved them ?

“ To me belongeth vengeance and recompence, saith the Lord,” but man, presumptuous man, evokes the cause from Heaven to earth, and to be his own avenger, ventures the *change* of being sent without preparation to the tribunal of God, with all his sins and imperfections, and it may be the blood of his opponent, on his head.

P

I presume

I presume not to pass a judgment on the state of those, who unhappily fall in duels, but I wish every person, professing Christianity, to weigh the matter most solemnly, before he either gives or accepts a challenge. My opinion on the matter is, with Soame Jennings, that a Christian, as such, cannot be a duellist.

The advocates for duelling contend, that on such occasions, all are on a par;—I deny it. The *equality* and *satisfaction* of a duel are indeed on the same level; but if a man of the roundity of a *Falstaff*, should be called out to meet one as thin as a slice of *Gloucester cheese*, what equality could there be between such combatants? It would be as difficult to *miss* the one as to *hit* the other.

It is dangerous to meet any man on his *own ground*; if a merchant is to quit his peaceful habits of life, at the imperious call of honour, to meet a man whose trade is war, and who, from constant practice, is in the habit of aiming well, (and many such gentlemen amuse themselves by practising at a mark) the odds are greatly in favour of a man of war, and the duellist by profession.

If

If a man, who is in straitened circumstances and has a numerous family, is called out to meet a man of affluence, who has none, to put them on an equal footing, the rich man should make an adequate settlement, previous to the fight, upon the family of his opponent, in case he should fall; otherwise his wife and children would sit heavy on his soul, palsy his hand, unnerve his arm, and render him incapable of taking aim with the coolness of his antagonist.

I am persuaded, that if the Clergy would take up this business, as a body, with that seriousness which it merits, (and it is *their bounden duty* so to do) this evil might be checked in a great measure, if not totally eradicated.

Why should not a board of honour be appointed, as well as a board of trade, to decide upon all points of honour between contending parties, whose award should be conclusive, and submitted by the parties, on pain of being declared infamous and sent to Coventry, till they restored themselves to society, by submitting to its law.

Would there be any very great difficulty in selecting and appointing two or three arbitrators, venerable for years and integrity, to be peace-makers in every parish or district? Let the King speak out on this point, and give the tone to the Court; let the commanders of our fleets and armies give it out in general orders, that a duellist will be deemed an infamous character, and degraded from the rank of a gentleman; let the Parliament echo the sound to the Nation, and the Clergy of all denominations press it on the consciences of their respective hearers; and before the 19th century a duellist would be considered as a murderer, covered with infamy, and be hunted out of the pale of rational society.

There was a time, when it might have been said, with truth, of duelling,

“ Oh! fatal thirst for fame—oh! glorious heat!—

“ Only destructive to the *brave* and *great*!”

But in our time, when duelling is the order of the day, on the most trivial as well as the most serious occasions, and recurred to by the lower classes of society as frequently as by those who are in a more elevated sphere, it is necessary for
the

the best interests of mankind, that the fashion should be exploded, and the false fire of the ignis fatuus of honour be for ever extinguished.

IRREVERENTLY TRIFLING WITH THE NAME OF
THE LORD.

“ Because of swearing the land mourneth.”

Jeremiah.

HOW shocking to a serious mind, is that common profanation of the name of the Lord, which pervades all ranks of society. If we go into our senate, or court of law, how often are our ears wounded, when the learned orator is at a loss what next to advance, with the shocking apostrophe of my God! good God! I protest to my God!

If we enter into our theatres, what serious mind, but must be hurt at the name of God being introduced so frequently, and too often on trifling occasions?

If

If we pass on to the circles of fashionable life, we have still the same profanation to lament, even at the card tables; my God, Sir! and Lord, madam! are brought in, on any paltry error in the game that is pending; and God, Lord, and Christ, are exclamations that are used to supply the want of more appropriate expressions, and are bandied about with all that *sang froid*, which marks the breeding of the *haut ton*; and when an argument is so involved in intricacy, that even a wager cannot decide it, how easily do our boys of fashion, settle the most abstruse points, with the bold and rash assertion of, it is so, by God! and by God, it shall be so! and if we look to our public seminaries, would it not be a libel on truth, to write on their doors, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, thou hast perfected praise?"

As this is an evil that strikes at the very roots of Religion, and at the sanctions of national justice, (for when the name of God is held so cheap, no wonder that perjury disgraces our courts, (let us endeavour to trace it to some of the various sources that swell this deluge

deluge of profaneness, to be enabled the better to counteract its pernicious tendency.

One principal source is, making oaths the sanction upon so many common occasions. Look into the various branches of physical operation; are not oaths, the test upon the most trifling, as well as the most important subjects? If we enter the chambers of our Judges, the loose manner of administering oaths, cannot impress the mind with any very solemn idea of the obligation, or nature of an oath; and if oaths upon judicial, or commercial occasions, are so common, it is not to be wondered at, that an inferior degree of guilt, in thoughtlessly taking the name of God in vain, should so generally prevail.

It may have occurred to some zealous partizan, that I have never once applied the epithet of my LORD, to the Bishop of Salisbury. I have not withheld it from personal disrespect, but from an opinion that I have formed, perhaps erroneously, that it is improper, for prince, peer, or prelate, to arrogate to himself, the title of LORD. I am aware the term is applied to man, about a score times in the Old and
New

New Testament, but it is assumed by THE LORD, not less than 3000 times, and to the LORD alone, ought such a title to be given.

But having, for argument's sake, the objection to the *creature* assuming the title of the *Creator*, what serious mind, but must agree with me, in regretting that such epithets, as MOST HIGH, MOST EXCELLENT, MOST MIGHTY, MOST PUSSANT, the attributes of *Deity alone*, should ever be ascribed to mortal man! It must be allowed, that such titles are properly applicable only to the KING OF KINGS, and LORD OF LORDS, and it is as much to be wondered at, as lamented, that they should ever have found their way into any Christian church or state.

As such profane assumptions may be laid down without prejudice to the House of Peers, or making any essential alteration in our Constitution, let us on the next day of national humiliation,* not with our lips only, but with deep

* Every friend to the cause of Religion, must highly approve of the decorum of the King's going to the Chapel Royal on the late Thanksgiving Day, instead of making a public procession to St. Paul's, which could have no other tendency,

deep contrition of heart, draw nigh unto God, and humbly restore to him, those titles which belong to him alone.

That a Rev. Father in God, who should be accessible to the poorest, and the most humble of his flock, should ever think of putting such a bar, as the haughty sound of my Lord, between him, and those who might have occasion to address him, is but too striking an evidence of the ignorance and pride of the human heart. Surely, the title of Bishop of Salisbury, or of any other diocese, sounds as well, and is much more becoming the episcopal character, than the strange epithet of my Lord Bishop; and I trust, that to a British ear, Baron Rock, of Gibraltar, Earl of St. Vincent, Viscount Camperdown, and Baron Nelson of the Nile, &c. are titles more appropriate and noble, than the common name of my Lord, which is lost in the numerous croud of characters, who are thus profanely distinguished.

tendency, but to defeat the end of the proclamation, by emptying the Churches, instead of filling them.—“ The King at the Camp, and I not there.”—“ A Royal Procession, and I not see it.” The day of National Thanksgiving, should be either before or after the day appointed for a Royal Procession.

Q

Being

Being persuaded that a reform in these respects would rather strengthen than weaken our Constitution, and that so solemn a sacrifice of titles, that man ought never to have assumed, would be an acceptable act of national humiliation, and a striking lesson to all orders of people, to learn to reverence the name of the Lord; I look forward with an humble hope, that a day will come, when we shall “render
 “ unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s,
 “ and unto God the things that are God’s.”

DEPRAVITY OF MODERN MANNERS.

“ _____ Hæ nugæ seria ducent

“ In mala _____ ”

Horace.

ONE source of the general depravity of modern manners, is the indecorum, and obscenity of modern conversation. What company can we now frequent, where we shall not find the table-talk of such a texture, as to wound the youthful ear, corrupt the unformed mind, and to be a disgrace to the very stews from whence it must have originated.

So, far from countenancing pure habits in young minds, if perchance a youth, who has had sufficient firmness of character to resist the temptations which surround him on every side, should unfortunately fall into such company, is he not held up as a butt for the ridicule of the rest to shoot at? Do such think that there is any wit in obscenity—any religion in laughing out of countenance all that is modest and serious?

Ar

Are they Christians, and do they not know that we are charged to put away all filthy conversation? Are they men, and will they thus persist in sacrificing the noblest energies of the human mind---the golden link that unites society---the soul-elevating and heart-purifying passion of virtuous love---upon the impure altar of lust? Let them appeal to their own hearts, whether these are “the pleasures of the evening that will bear the reflections of the morning,” and mark in their *practice*, as well as their *memories*, that excellent adage of the Earl of Roscommon :

“ Immodest words admit of no defence ;

“ for want of decency is want of sense.”

Perhaps this corruption of modern conversation may in part be owing to the modern rules of drinking, which, unfortunately for sobriety, and the interests of morality, prescribe one rule to all guests, however unequal their capability for deep potations,* not remembering that what is one man's meat is another man's poison,
and

* The modern rule, fill what you please, but drink what you fill, is certainly a great improvement in bacchanalian orgies :—a further improvement might be yet made, by leaving it to every one's option whether to fill or not.

and that the bumper which may elevate one into the regions of high conviviality, may lay another under the table, whence the oblivious draughts have flowed.

This custom of drinking to excess, and by uniform rule, would be “more honoured in the breach than the observance;” and might in some measure be checked, if the British fair, who give the sweet polish to all rational conversation, would not quit the table so soon, and would be earlier in their summonses to their knights companions to quit, as in the gallant days of chivalry, the service of Bacchus, and to rally under the banners of Beauty.

It is astonishing, how such a practice could have been introduced into a country, so famed for manly character as England; a practice unknown on the Continent, where every convivial entertainment would be considered as dreary, dark, and comfortless, unless lighted up by the chearing rays of female softness, elegance, and beauty.

When

When we consider, that the hours devoted to conversation equally unworthy of us, as men and Christians, might be so usefully filled up by a variety of cheerful and rational topics, I hope the clergy will not be offended with me, for suggesting, that beneficial effects might be produced, if, instead of withdrawing on such occasions, to give as it were a license to obscenity, they were to continue at their post, protesting, with manly boldness, that they should consider any observation incompatible with the decorum of their character, not only as an insult to their cloth, but as a flagrant breach of rights of hospitality; rights which every man, worthy of the courteous character of a GENTLEMAN, must hold too sacred to suffer them to be violated, by permitting any description of *guests* to be treated with rudeness at his own table, and under the *protection* of his own roof.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

“ The first principles of the Christian Religion should
“ not be *farced* with school points.”

Sander son.

IT is grievous to think of the worse than Egyptian bondage that the generous and glowing mind of our youth is obliged to submit to at public schools, in being drilled to church, not only on Sundays, but on all other holidays; and their young minds thus rendered averse to religion, from its being laid on them as a task or burthen too heavy for their tender years to bear. They enter upon the world surfeited with every thing that bears the name of religion, and disposed to prefer any conversation or pursuits that may be the reverse of those to which they have incurred an antipathy in their younger days, which “ grows with their growth, and strength-
“ ens with their strength;” and if it leaves them honest and moral deists, we have to congratulate ourselves on their escape from the dark abyss of atheism.

UNI-

UNIVERSITIES.

“ Who all the sacred mysteries of Heaven
 “ To their own *vile* advantages shall turn.”

Milton.

ANOTHER and more alarming source of the depravity of MODERN MANNERS is the practice of Universities, of not only persevering in the school discipline of compelling those, whose hearts are far away, to attend stated services, but also to receive the holy sacrament upon compulsion, and whether reeling from the gaming-table or the stews, or staggering from their bowls, “ unworthily to eat of that bread and “ drink of that cup.”

It is no answer to say, that it would be dangerous to reform customs that have come down to our times from the dark ages of ignorance. Whilst such customs are persevered in, the springs of morality are poisoned at the fountain head, and immorality and irreligion flow from those

those endowments, which were established by their benevolent founders, to promote the interests of piety and learning.

It is lamentable to think that the most sacred ordinance of Christianity should ever be made a test for political purposes ; but that it should be prostituted, as it is at Universities, is indeed a practice that calls aloud for reform ; and not on those who unwillingly act their parts on such an occasion, but on their heads who compel them, must the censure fall.

I will not wound the serious reader with allusions to scenes that are a reproach to any church or creed. I appeal to those ardent minds, who feel with just indignation that the portals of science are shut against them, unless they wade through the routine of religious mummary, and bring guilt upon their souls by drawing nigh to the Lord, whilst their hearts are far from him. I appeal to those who know Universities best, and the manner in which divine service is performed, and the Lord's Supper celebrated, to say whether the picture I have now held up is overcharged, however glaring its

R

colouring

colouring may be, not only to the eye of every thinking man, but of that God who is too pure to behold iniquity, or to accept any but free will offerings. **THESE THINGS OUGHT NOT TO BE.**

INATTENTIVE CONDUCT IN PLACES OF WORSHIP.

“ We bring our *manners* to the blest abodes,
 “ And think what pleases us must please the gods.”

Dryden.

PERSONS ought to make it a matter of conscience to be more punctual to the hours of public worship. When we are bidden to an earthly feast, we can be punctual to the appointment : but how is the serious part of a congregation, not only disgusted with the whispering and carelessness of many about them, and annoyed with the opening and shutting of doors, which begins with the commencement of the service, and seldom ceases till it closes.

If we consider the state of psalmody in our established churches, and the carelessness and indifference

difference of those who swell the loud organ, or assist in the solemn service of the choir, we must confess there is not much in such services, to impress the mind with just ideas of religion, and that we have much to learn from the dissenters in that respect, with whom saying prayers is the act of the whole congregation, and not confined to the nasal twang of the clerk, or to the musical efforts in the gallery of a country church to a few individuals, who, with the help of an oboe, and so forth, arrogate to themselves the office of offering up psalms and anthems for a whole congregation.

If in churches, where there is an organ instead of the voluntary, a psalm or anthem were performed, in which the whole congregation joined, it appears to me to be more suitable to the nature of divine service. If those who play the organ or chant cathedral services, have any other churches to attend, their quitting one church to do their duty at another, must be excused, otherwise it is a great indecorum, for such gentlemen to quit a place of worship, so soon as they have performed their own part in the service, as if they thought all the rest of little consequence,

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

“ ———— I’ll startle you
 “ Worse than the *sacring* bell.”

Shakespeare.

IT is much to be lamented, that those, who profess themselves Christians, should, in life and spirit, reverse the example and precepts of it’s blessed author.

In him we find *all gentleness, long suffering, unaffected humility, and unbounded charity.*—When John told him,—“ Master we saw one casting
 “ out devils in thy name, and we *forbad* him,
 “ because he FOLLOWED NOT WITH US.” Instead of approving their conduct, or condemning this unordained *caster* out of devils, Jesus said, “ FORBID HIM NOT, for he that is not
 “ against us is for us.”

When the sons of Zebedee were for calling down fire from Heaven on the heads of those whom they thought their enemies, Christ rebuked them,

them, and said unto them, “ye know not what
“ *manner of spirit ye are of.*” Instead of preach-
ing up the love of self, all his discourses and ac-
tions glow with unlimited philanthropy, and a
generous attention to the wants of others.

A PLEA FOR THE POOR.

“ How shall we then wish that it might be allowed us to
“ live our lives over again, in order to fill *every minute* of
“ them with *charitable offices.*”

Atterbury.

OUR Lord also taught his Disciples, when
they made a feast not to ask their rich friends
and kindred only, but to call in the poor and
those who had it not in their power to invite
them in return. Is this the practice in our
times? certainly not—but would it not be an
improvement, if we were to adopt and act up
to this benevolent principle, and whenever we
give entertainments, have a table spread for the
poor, as well as for the rich*; or so much mo-
ney

* I have been informed that a worthy vicar in a parish in
Hampshire, gives a dinner to six or eight poor people
every Sunday—his Clerk sits at the head of their table. An
example worthy of imitation.

ney distributed amongst them abroad, as we spend in regaling ourselves at home : how many poor housekeepers whom the weight of *modern* taxes hath brought low, and this new Tax on Income will, I fear, bring lower yet, who are too dignified to beg, and too old or infirm to work, would such a practice be the means of relieving.

Though genuine Charity, according to the precepts of our Lord, would keep the good her right hand doth a secret from her left ; yet as an example to others, and for the sake of society, we must sacrifice our feelings, and do good in the face of day, rather than leave our duty undone. What a charming employment would it be, for young almoners to do good by stealth ; and how finely would a blush, to find it fame, light up the glowing cheek of modest youth ; how many cold bosoms might thus be warmed, how many sick pillows smoothed, and how would our hearts burn within us, in the “ luxury of doing good,” whilst such a custom, if generally adopted, would diffuse peace, happiness, and a comparative Heaven to all within our respective spheres.

There

There is not a class in society more entitled to relief and esteem, than Housekeepers, who are under a necessity of keeping up a decent appearance, although their scanty incomes are not equal to the exigencies of a growing family. How often are housekeepers thus circumstanced, called on to contribute towards the wants of others, that relief which they themselves stand in equal need of. How often do they steal a wishful glance at provisions given to the avowed poor, which their keen appetites would be glad to share with them; did not proper pride forbid! For there is, as it hath been well observed, “ a proper pride that becomes every man, and a poor man of all others, ought not to be without it,” lest he should be trampled under foot by the insolence of wealth, or the apathy of avarice.

The firmness of the Spartan Boy, who suffered a fox under his cloak to bite him to death, rather than incur the disgrace of avowing that he had stolen him, hath been deservedly celebrated; and shall we not honour the more than Spartan virtue of these victims to decorum, in concealing that poverty which daily is consuming

ing their spirits, and preying on their very vitals.

It is in vain to talk of the enormous sums raised by Poor Rates; the question is, are the poor sufficiently relieved? Law questions of Settlements between parish and parish, churchwardens and overseers feasts, and salaries to vestry clerks, cut so deep into this fund that we cannot look into any village or town, but we shall find many a Lazarus dying of wounds and wants, unnoticed and unrelieved by the Dives of his district. If the leading gentry in every township or village, would once a week have a copper filled with nourishing broth or soup for their poor or sick neighbours, without *confining* their benevolence to the *pale of any church*, sect, or party, the good that would be done to society is incalculable; such a practice, if brought into general fashion, would check the progress of vice and villainy with more sure and rapid strides than the increase of sanguinary penal laws, solitary confinement, bastiles, or public executions.

Our

Our Lord condescended himself, to wash his Disciples feet, an example that is to this day imitated by the Emperor of Germany ; nor do I know whether there are sufficient grounds for neglecting the practice in our country, contrary to a positive precept in the Gospel.—Christ himself tells his Disciples, “ If I then, “ your Lord and Master, have washed your “ feet, *ye also ought* to wash one another’s feet.” But waving that question, if we do not literally wash the feet of our poor brethren, we ought to make smooth their rugged path.

What a charming employment it would be for the leisure hours of our fair countrywomen, to devote some part of that time which is lost in cards, scandal, and dissipation, to works of mercy ;—to employ some part of their leisure hours in making up warm garments for their distressed fellow creatures, and thus seeking out the cells of poverty, becoming feet to the lame and eyes to the blind.

Fashion led the way of these good works on behalf of our soldiers in Germany ; and a blessed fashion would it be were it now adopted on the behalf of our poor who are at home.

S

I would

I would not be so far misunderstood, as to be thought to insinuate that we are deficient in charity in the present day, by no means: the many public and private charities of every denomination are, amongst much surrounding evil, an honourable testimony to the age in which we live; but they are local and confined; and individual charity can alone explore the gloomy haunts of individual misery.--Whilst we are speaking of the numerous charities that do honour to the British Nation, it would be unjust to withhold a due tribute of applause from the Corporation, Merchants, and Bankers of London; and particularly from the Gentlemen of Lloyd's Coffee-House, whose unbounded liberality on all public and private occasions, reflects a lustre on the country which gave them birth*.

* Those generous Spirits who have so liberally subscribed to the Funds for Relief of the wounded, and of the brave Men who gloriously fell in the late Sea Engagements, will not, I trust, be displeased with my contributing one Sprig to the Wreath of Glory that encircles the brows of our Naval Heroes.

NAVAL TRIUMPHS.

In the famous, famous days of old,
When our HARRYS brave, and EDWARDS bold,
Cas'd in armour bright as gold,
Bade OLD ENGLAND's banners wave;

How

How easy would it be for such benevolent
spirits to institute a society for the purpose of
relieving persons in straitened circumstances,

S 2

whose

Rous'd by the soul-inspiring flame
Of AGINCOURT's or CRESSY's fame,
Full many a Knight of gallant name
Resolv'd on Glory or the Grave.

In good Queen Bess's golden days,
The *invincible* ARMADA's blaze
(Not unto us, but Heaven the praise)
Loud proclaim'd, our naval sway ;
And now,—where'er our country calls,
We boldly steer our WOODEN WALLS ;
A NELSON bleeds ! a WESTCOTT falls !
But triumph crowns the glorious day.

Lo ! whilst grateful Pœans rise,
Gory wounds and streamy eyes,
For BRITAIN'S WEAL the sacrifice,
Claim our sympathetic sigh ;
SONS OF THE WAVE, your country's pride,
Ye *offspring* of the BRAVE WHO DIED,
Sooth'd be your pangs, your sorrows dried,
'Tis GLORY THUS to bleed or die.

Nor have OUR HEROES bled in vain ;
Nurs'd by VICTORY on the main,
The CHERUB PEACE shall smile again,
War and groans be heard no more !
Rule BRITANNIA ! great and free ;
Thine HOWES, VINCENTS, DUNCANS, be ;
Thine the EMPIRE OF THE SEA,
Until its waves shall cease to roar !

This Song, with the Music, to be had of the Publisher of this Work.

whose situation in life would not permit them to solicit or receive relief on any eleemosynary footing. If such a society were formed, and notice given in the public papers, that any cases of real distress would be investigated and relieved by a Committee appointed for that purpose, through the medium of the public prints, the children of misfortune might make known their wants and woes, and receive relief from dignified benevolence, without having their feelings wounded, or their modesty put to the blush, under the galling sense of obligation.

Were the principles I have been recommending generally acted on throughout the kingdom, benevolence would pervade the land, and many a meandering village stream of individual charity would flow with a rapid tide into the blessed ocean of national benevolence.

A WARNING VOICE TO THE RICH.

“ O for that warning voice, which he, who saw
“ The Apocalypse, heard cry in Heaven aloud !”

Milton.

“ What riches give us let us first enquire ;
“ Meat, fire, and cloaths ; what more—meat, cloaths,
“ and fire.”

Pope.

IT is much to be lamented that the rich have not the Gospel preached unto them. Fear of offending a rich Patron, restrains the tongue of a poor Curate. The Clergy should speak out in this respect. Are not the souls of the rich as *valuable* as those of the poor ? The rich ought to be taught the right use of riches, to be roused to lay up for themselves treasures in Heaven, and to be warned of the danger of their situation, by having that awful denunciation of Christ sounded in their ears, “ Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall *hardly* enter into “ the Kingdom of Heaven.”

And

And again I say unto you, “ It is easier for
 “ a camel to go through the eye of a needle,
 “ than for a rich man to enter into the King-
 “ dom of God.”

It is a disgrace to men of affluent incomes, that they spend so much on themselves, and so little on objects who have a right to their bounty. The poor subterfuge, that if they are too proud to ask, they must go without, will not avail them in the great day of retribution. Let them form themselves into numerous societies throughout the kingdom, and meet frequently to enquire, with all delicacy, into the situation of their needy neighbours, and to contrive to relieve their wants without letting them feel the weight of the obligation.

If the rich would but discharge their duty actively and conscientiously in this UPPER WALK of true philanthropy, how many families might be snatched from bankruptcy and ruin by a well timed loan or donation ; and how many sweets might be thrown into the bitter cup of poverty, of which humble worth, as things are, is left unpitied and unassisted, to drain the very dregs.

dregs. As Avarice never wants an excuse for not breaking in on uselefs hoards, perhaps it may be objected, that doing so much for the poor would make them idle, and enable them to shake off that dependence on the rich, which is the best pledge for their industry ; on the contrary, I am persuaded it would produce the happiest effects in society. I am not recommending *the chimera of equality*, but a melioration in the condition of the poor. The relief that I wish to have extended to them, would neither make them idle nor independent, but it would strengthen them for the duties of that station in which a wise Providence hath placed them. One principal cause of the rich neglecting the poor is, the paltry ambition of dying worth a large sum ; this is an error that ought to be corrected. A man lives worth what he actually enjoys and bestows, but cannot be said to die worth any thing. “ We brought nothing into this world, and it is “ certain we can carry nothing out.” If the rich would give this Common Prayer Book observation due weight, they would enjoy the cream of the good things of this life with greater luxury and security, if they allowed the poor a portion of their skimmed milk. It is better to have the blessing of the poor on our heads, whilst living

living, than to die worth (as the phrase is) a plumb.

Dr. Young has placed this vice or foible, (which shall we call it ?) in strong colours.

“ Unbit by rage canine
 “ Of *dying rich*—GUILT’S BLUNDER,
 “ And the loudest laugh of Hell !”

When the passion for accumulation is carried to such an extent, as to induce men to hoard up and add those sums in increase of their income, which ought to be paid to their tradesmen and servants, it is an aggravated robbery on society, that can neither be palliated nor justified ; and if it be not felony at the bar of man, it will not pass without retribution at the tribunal of God. The Apostle James, in the last Chapter of his Epistle, speaks out on this point : “ Behold the
 “ hire of your labourers who have reaped down
 “ your fields, which is of you kept back by
 “ fraud, crieth ; and the cries of them which
 “ have reaped, are entered into the ears of the
 “ Lord of Sabaoth.” Rich men may look down with contempt on their fellow creatures, and mistake wealth for happiness. The philosopher

sopher knows that happiness is more equally distributed than it appears to be to a superficial observer.

This Apostle did not seem to think riches desirable ; he thus addresses the men of wealth, “ Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl because of your miseries.” Not that the possession of wealth is in itself an evil, on the contrary, it is an estimable blessing with a liberal mind, and is a rich source of consciousness to those generous spirits who improve these transitory treasures, by snatching at every opportunity of doing good to their fellow creatures ; but to those who have no thought nor care but for themselves, and whose hearts are more hard and cold than the iron chests wherein their golden images sleep, is the denunciation addressed—“ Your gold and silver is cankered, “ and the RUST OF THEM shall be a witness “ against you.”

For my part, I would rather emulate the character of the man of Rofs whilst I live, than be said to die worth the wealth of a Nabob :

T

“ Behold

" Behold the market-place with poor o'erspread,
 " The Man of Rofs divides the weekly bread;
 " He feeds yon alms-house neat, but void of state,
 " Where age and want sit smiling at the gate:
 " Him, portion'd maids, apprentic'd orphans, blest
 " The young who labour, and the old who rest.

It would be sound policy in the rich to adopt such measures: it would be setting up a stronger barrier against revolutionary principles, than passing two acts to restrain discussion, which must be ineffectual, unless human legislatures could prevent men from thinking or feeling: they may stop our mouths, but they should remember, there are groans not loud but deep, and that smothered fires burn most fiercely. Were the rich to act thus nobly, they would have nothing to fear from the envy, and every thing to hope and rely on from the affection and gratitude of their poor neighbours, and would find by experience, that to be good and to be happy are synonymous terms.—The parochial clergy of every denomination should be active in the discharge of this part of their duty, and in pointing out to their wealthy hearers proper objects for relief, always remembering, and pressing with line upon line, and precept upon precept, on the hearts

and

and consciences of their respective audiences,
 the blessed words of our common Lord "I was
 " an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was
 " thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a
 " stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye
 " cloathed me; I was sick, and ye visited me;
 " I was in prison, and ye came unto me."

Then shall the righteous answer him, saying,
 " Lord, when saw we thee an hungry and fed
 " thee, or thirsty and gave thee drink? When
 " saw we thee a stranger and took thee in, or
 " naked and cloathed thee? Or when saw we
 " thee sick or in prison and came unto thee?"
 And the King shall answer, and say unto them,
 " Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have
 " done it unto one of the *least of these my*
 " *brethren*, ye have done it UNTO ME!"

CONCLUSION.

“ I will conclude with the Speech of a Counsellor of State.”

Bacon.

IT will naturally occur to every serious reader, that the subjects of the preceding chapter must be considered as recommended by a *christian* pastor to ministers and hearers, *professing christianity*. There are many points on which we cannot expect honest deists to think with us ; but we trust that whilst we are earnest to see a spirit of primitive christianity revived amongst us, that they will readily concur in every effort to meliorate the condition of suffering humanity, and to restore the moral dignity of human nature.

When I call to mind the primitive simplicity of a WILSON—the learning and piety of a TILLOTSON—the luminous talents of a LOUTH and a LANDAFF—the constitutional zeal of a BURNET,

or

or a SHIPLEY, * I look up to the episcopal bench with regard and veneration.

With the present Bishop of Salisbury I have not the honour of being personally acquainted, but have been informed that his learning reflects lustre on his exalted station. Giving him credit for sincerity, and rectitude of intention, I trust, upon due consideration, he will himself be of opinion that the dissenters have a right to be alarmed at his late pastoral charge, and that so much of it as accuses them with deluding their hearers, and insinuates that they cover political views inimical to our Constitution, under the specious mask of religion, was as *unworthy* of him, as it is *unjust* to them.

But however I may be inclined to respect episcopal characters whilst they act in character, when they so far forget themselves as to become mere ministerial puppets, or advocates for intolerance or passive obedience, I will not suffer any motives of false delicacy to prevent me from discharging what I feel to be my duty to society.

* The late worthy Bishop of St. Asaph, who was for a long time the ONLY BISHOP who voted against the American war.

society. What friend to civil liberty or to the House of Brunswick can read, without indignation, a speech, said to be delivered by a certain learned Bishop in a great Assembly, telling us that the parliament is the king's, the law is the king's, and that the people's *only duty* is to *obey*? If the parliament and the law had been the king's, and the people, instead of obeying, had not discharged their sacred duty of resistance to tyrants, the House of Stuart might to this day have filled the British throne; yet men who dare to broach *such doctrines* affect to call themselves the KING'S FRIENDS! Such speeches, it cannot be denied, are very doubtful evidence of their *attachment* to the House of Hanover, and may be very fairly summed up in the following lines:

" Yes, I can prove from *holy saws*,

" The *parliament's* the *King's*, so are the *laws*,

" The people's *only duty* to obey :"—

Doctor you're right to LAMBETH—THAT'S THE WAY !



FINIS.


~~~~~

*The great hurry in which this Pamphlet has been brought out, owing to the Author's unwillingness to admit of any farther delay in its publication, must be his Apology with every candid Reader for the following or any other*

ERRATA.

- Page 32, line 2, for 'in,' read 'is.'  
78, line 19, for 'eligio,' read 'eligo.'  
92, line 13, 14, for 'weak and wicked.' read 'weak as wicked.'  
107, line 6, for 'little pig,' read 'tythe pig.'  
    line 14, for 'either,' read 'any other.'  
    line 16, for 'bounty,' read 'country.'  
109, line 2, for 'cenfor.' read 'consideration.'  
111, line 5, for 'discourfe,' read 'discouragement.'  
113, line 21, for 'change,' read 'chance.'  
119, line 5, for 'physical,' read 'fiscal.'  
120, line 4, for 'having,' read 'waving.'  
143, line 22, dele 'Common Prayer Book.'  
146, line 10, dele the word 'two.'  
150, Read the last line thus: 'Doctor, you're right  
    to LAMBETH—that's the way.'
- ~~~~~